1012 d 23

DR. RUTHERFORTH'S
LETTER
TO
MR. KENNICOTT.

Tho. Birch
Dorsetshire Antiquaries
Novemb. 17. 1761.

A LETTER

TO

THE REVEREND MR. KENNICOTT,

IN WHICH

His Defence of the Samaritan Pentateuch is examined, and his *ſecond* Diſſertation *on the State of the printed Hebrew Text of the Old Teſtament* is ſhewn to be in many inſtances injudicious and inaccurate.

WITH

A POSTSCRIPT, occaſioned by his advertiſing, before this Letter was printed, that he had an Anſwer to it in the Preſs.

By T. RUTHERFORTH D.D. F.R.S.
THE KINGS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN CAMBRIDGE,
And CHAPLAIN to
HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS DOWAGER OF WALES.

CAMBRIDGE,
Printed by J. BENTHAM, Printer to the UNIVERSITY:
For Meſſrs THURLBOURN and WOODYER in Cambridge; and ſold by J. RICHARDSON and J. BEECROFT in Pater-Noſter-Row, A. MILLAR in the Strand, and C. BATHURST in Fleet-ſtreet, London.

M.DCC.LXI.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

A

LETTER

TO

The Reverend Mr. KENNICOTT.

REVEREND SIR,

WHEN you were laſt at Cambridge, you had heard of my having ſaid, that your ſecond Diſſertation *on the ſtate of the printed Hebrew text of the Old Teſtament* is in many inſtances injudicious and inaccurate: and you took care to let me know, that you looked upon this to be very injurious treatment; unleſs I would publiſh my objections. For my own part; though I then thought, and ſtill think, that I have a full right of ſpeaking my ſentiments about any books, which I have read, and eſpecially about any of this ſort, without being obliged to give an account of myſelf to the public for what I have ſaid of them; I ſhould have made no difficulty about promiſing you, that I would print ſuch of my remarks, as appear to me to juſtify both parts of my aſſertion; if I had not been afraid, that the neceſſary buſineſs of my office would have prevented me from putting them together in ſuch a manner, as to make them intelligible. But the leiſure of a vacation has given me an opportunity of obliging you: for though, if I had had more time, I might have been able to have brought them into a narrower compaſs, and perhaps to have made them clearer; yet I hope, that the reader with as little trouble, as he could well expect in a work of this ſort, will be commonly able to underſtand my meaning.

[a] You have very lately declared in print, that "you cannot think yourſelf at liberty to lay out any "of

[a] See a monthly pamphlet called the *Library*, &c. Number v. pag. 263.

" of your time, which is become the time of the " public, in any employment foreign to the work " (of collating the Hebrew MSS of the old teſtament) " in which you are now engaged; and that no man, " who wiſhes you ſucceſs in this work can deſire you " to enter into controverſy." I aſſure you, that I think it a very uſeful work, and that I heartily wiſh you ſucceſs in it: but the ſucceſs, which I mean, does not *wholly* conſiſt in obtaining your own benefit by a large ſubſcription; it includes the benefit, which the public expects to receive from your care and exactneſs in making the collations and in repreſenting the various readings. And certainly if in the new edition of the bible, which you propoſe to give us, with theſe readings ſubjoined at the bottom of the page, you deſign to ſuggeſt any principles for determining which of them is moſt likely to be genuine, and to apply theſe principles as you go along; this future work, unleſs it is executed judiciouſly, will, inſtead of being a uſeful one, be likely to miſlead your readers in a matter of the higheſt importance. If therefore by pointing out to you ſuch inſtances of inaccuracy and of injudicious reaſoning, as I have obſerved in your book, I ſhould put you upon your guard, and ſhould make you more attentive to facts, as well as more exact in relating them, whilſt you are carrying on your preſent work, and leſs haſty in your concluſions, when you engage in that, which is to follow it; I ſhall think, that I have done ſervice to the public, and have contributed to the ſucceſs of both.

But be this as it will. When you ſet forth the right, which you thought you had to expect, that I ſhould publiſh my remarks, you knew, as well as you do at preſent, that your time was the time of the public: ſo that your late declaration ought not to prevent me from printing them, now I have an opportunity. It is well known, that I have not much more time to ſpare than you have; and to ſay the truth, I have ſo little leiſure for controverſy, that I queſtion, whe-

ther I ſhould have prevailed upon myſelf to comply with your demand, if I had not been well informed, that you have made it neceſſary for me to publiſh my remarks in my own juſtification by the ſingular pains, which you have taken, both by letters and in converſation, to repreſent me every where as having highly injured you by making ſuch futile objections, as you anſwered, even to my own ſatisfaction, as ſoon as you heard them, the foundation of charging your book with being injudicious and inaccurate. Now I have, as you required me, ſubmitted my objections to the judgment of the public, our readers will be able to determine for themſelves, how futile they are; and how far any anſwers, which you may think proper to give them, are ſatisfactory. Whether you have ever heard them all before, or not? Whether you attempted to give any anſwer, or not, to thoſe, which you did hear? And whether I was, or was not, ſatisfied with ſuch anſwers, as you gave to any of them?—are now become queſtions of little or no importance.

I meet with ſeveral inſtances of inaccuracy and injudicious reaſoning in your firſt chapter, in which you undertake to ſhew, that Deut. xxvii. 4. was corrupted by the Jews, and not by the Samaritans. It may therefore not be improper to lay before the reader the ſtate of this queſtion; and the rather, becauſe I deſign, as we go along, not only to point out your own miſtakes in this chapter, but likewiſe to make ſome remarks upon thoſe arguments, which you have borrowed from Mr. Whiſton.

[a] The Samaritans were originally deſcended from a colony of Cuthæans, Avites, Hamathites, and Sepharvites, whom Eſarhaddon, who is called Aſnapper in the book of Ezra, brought from Babylon, and placed in the cities of Samaria inſtead of the ten tribes of the Iſraelites, whom his grandfather Shalmaneſer had carried away captive into Aſſyria.

[a] 2 Kin. xvii. 3. 6. 24. Ezra. iv. 2. 10. Prideaux's connections &c. 8vo. edit. P. i. B. i. pag. 29, 30.

[b] The Jews, when they firſt returned from their captivity in Babylon, frequently took wives from amongſt thoſe ſtrangers, who were ſettled in their neighbourhood; notwitſtanding ſuch marriages are forbidden by the law of Moſes. Amongſt the reſt one of the ſons of Joiada the high-prieſt, whom Joſephus calls Manaſſeh, about 270 years after the firſt ſettlement of this colony, married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, who was then the governour of Samaria: and when Nehemiah to remedy this enormity forced all thoſe, who had taken ſtrange wives, either to part with them or to leave the country; he refuſed to part with his wife, and fled to Samaria, accompanied thither by many other Jews, who were in the ſame circumſtances with himſelf. Darius Nothus coming about this time into Phœnicia, Sanballat obtained from him a grant to build a temple in mount Gerizim in the territory of Samaria like that at Jeruſalem, and to make his ſon-in-law Manaſſeh high prieſt of it.

[c] As ſoon as this temple was built, Samaria became the common refuge of all the Jews, who were likely to be called to an account for any breach of the Moſaic law. And from theſe apoſtate Jews, and the ſtrangers, who had been brought into Samaria by Eſarhaddon, the preſent Samaritans are deſcended, through whoſe hands what is called the Samaritan pentateuch, that is, the five books of Moſes in the Hebrew language, but in Samaritan characters, have been tranſmitted to us.

This Samaritan copy of the pentateuch differs in ſeveral places from the Hebrew copy, that is, from the pentateuch, which the Jews have tranſmitted to us, and which is written, as in the Hebrew language, ſo likewiſe in what are uſually called Hebrew characters. One of theſe differences is the ſubject of your firſt chapter. "[d] God by Moſes commanded the Iſrael-
" ites, when they ſhould have paſſed over Jordan in-
" to

[b] Nehem. xiii. 23.—28. Prideaux P. i. B. vi. pag. 410. 413. Ezra ix. v. paſſim. [c] Prid. ut ſup. pag. 414. Joſeph. xi. 8.
[d] Diſſ. 2. p. 25. &c. Deut xi. 29. xxvii. 2—8.

" to the land of Canaan, *to put a bleſſing upon mount* " *Gerizim and a curſe upon mount Ebal*; — two moun- " tains near each other, and having between them, " at the foot of Gerizim, a ſmall town antiently call- " ed Sichem or Schechem, but afterwards Neapolis, " and now Naploſe." They were likewiſe command- ed to ſet up on one of theſe mountains great ſtones, and to plaiſter them with plaiſter, and to write on them what Moſes calls *all the words of this law*; and alſo to build there an altar of whole ſtones, on which no iron tool was to be lifted up, and to offer burnt- offerings and peace-offerings there; and to eat there, and to rejoice before the Lord their God. The moun- tain, on which this altar was to be built, and this ſer- vice to be performed, is Gerizim in the Samaritan pentateuch, and Ebal in the Hebrew. [e] It is agreed amongſt the learned, that this variation is not the ef- fect of careleſſneſs, but a wilful corruption, and that either the Samaritans have deſignedly put Gerizim in- ſtead of Ebal in their copies, or the Jews Ebal inſte of Gerizim in theirs. And in this chapter you undertake to prove, that this wilful corruption is to be charged on the Jews, and [f] not, as Bootius and Buxtorf the younger, Carpzovius and Leuſden, Hottinger and Lightfoot, Patrick and Calmet, Uſher and Du-Pin, Prideaux and Walton, Simon and Houbigant have charged it, on the Samaritans.

Mr. Whiſton undertook to prove the ſame thing, in his Eſſay *towards reſtoring the true text of the old teſtament*, &c. printed in the year 1722. I ſhall conſider the arguments, which he has made uſe of, in the order, in which I find them in his book: and I ſhall lay them before my readers in his own words; partly that they may ſee what miſtakes are your own, where the argument, which you are managing, is properly his; and partly that, if they have not met with his Eſſay, they may ſee how much you are obliged to him

[e] Diſſ. 2. pag. 27. [f] Diſſ. 2. pag. 21.

him without acknowledging it. But perhaps, though you have never mentioned his name or referred to his book, whilſt you are uſing his arguments, you may call it an acknowledgment of your having been obliged to him, that in [g] *a ſupplement to your other obſervations on this ſubject*, you ſay, that "Collins em-"ploys a great part of his book againſt Mr. Whiſton "—who, though wrong in ſeveral of his notions, "has made learned and judicious remarks on diffe-"rent ſubjects, and many valuable obſervations on "the printed text of the old teſtament, particularly "on the famous text of Deuteronomy before con-"ſidered: and this text he ſuppoſed right in the Sa-"maritan copy, though he has not touched the ſtrong-"eſt arguments in proof of it." — If you think proper to call this an acknowledgment; it is made in ſuch a place and in ſuch a manner, as would effectually prevent your readers, if they had not ſeen his book, from ſuſpecting, that ſome of the beſt arguments, which you make uſe of to ſupport your opinion, are borrowed from it. —What ſuch of your readers, as have ſeen it, will be likely to think of an acknowledgment, which could ſcarce fail of producing this effect, I leave you to judge.

Mr. Whiſtons firſt argument is —[h] "that in all "other caſes the Samaritans cannot be cenſured, but "the Jews; which makes it unreaſonable to charge "the corruption upon the Samaritans without evident "proof." — You argue thus — "If from the worthy "diſpoſition of the Samaritans, and from their pro-"found veneration for the law of Moſes, they ſhould "be thought leſs likely to have made the wilful cor-"ruption, which we are here conſidering, it may be "obſerved, that — ſhould this wilful corruption be "charged upon the Jews, it will not be the firſt "charge againſt them of this particular nature." Whether you have made out the general good character

[g] Diſſ. pag. 25. 109.

[h] Eſſay &c. pag. 169. Diſſ. 2. pag. 47.

racter of the Samaritans at all, and whether, as far as you ſuppoſe yourſelf to have made it out, it is any thing to the purpoſe, ſhall be conſidered in another place. What I would enquire about now is, whether you have been accurate in the particular inſtances, which you produce to make good Mr. Whiſtons general charge againſt the Jews of having corrupted the bible.

You ſay, [a] that " St, Jerom, commenting on Gal. " iii. 10. (*It is written curſed is every one, that con-* " *tinueth not in all things, which are written in the book* " *of the law to do them*) has the following very re- " markable words. — Hunc morem habeo, ut quo- " tieſcunque ab apoſtolis de veteri inſtrumento ali- " quid ſumitur, recurram ad originales libros, et dili- " genter inſpiciam, quomodo in ſuis locis ſcripta ſint. " Inveni itaque in Deuteronomio hoc ipſum apud " LXX interpretes ita poſitum; *maledictus omnis ho-* " *mo, qui non permanſerit in omnibus ſermonibus legis* " *hujus* — Ex quo incertum habemus, utrum LXX " interpretes addiderint *omnis homo* et in *omnibus*; an " in veteri hebraico ita fuerit, et poſtea a Judæis de- " letum ſit. In hanc me autem ſuſpicionem illa res " ſtimulat, quod verbum *omnis* et in *omnibus* quaſi " ſenſui ſuo neceſſarium, ad probandum illud, quod " quicunque ex operibus legis ſunt, ſub maledicto " ſint, apoſtolus, vir Hebrææ peritiæ, et in lege doc- " tiſſimus, nunquam protuliſſet; niſi in Hebræis volu- " minibus haberetur. Quam ob cauſam Samaritano- " rum Hebræa volumina relegens, inveni כל (quod " interpretatur *omnis* ſive *omnibus*) ſcriptum eſſe, et " cum LXX interpretibus concordare. Fruſtra igitur " illud tulerunt Judæi, ne viderentur eſſe ſub male- " dicto, ſi non poſſent *omnia* complere, quæ ſcripta " ſunt. Cum antiquiores alterius quoque gentis literæ " id poſitum fuiſſe teſtantur.

" You remark, that not only the Samaritan text and " verſion

[a] Diſſert. 2. pag. 47. 48. 51.

" verſion printed in the *French and Engliſh Polyglotts*,
" but alſo *all* our Samaritan MSS, which contain this
" verſe, read כל *omnis* agreeably to thoſe Samaritan
" MSS examined by St. Jerom. It is therefore matter
" of great ſurprize to you, that the learned Cellarius
" ſhould affirm the direct contrary, at leaſt as to the
" printed copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch; for
" he ſays — neque in Ebræo-Samaritano, neque
" in verſione Samaritana hodie כל *omnis* apparet.
" Horæ Samar. p. 55."

Be pleaſed, Sir, to read this text, Deut. xxvii. 26, over again in the pentateuch of the Samaritans, as it is printed in the *French and Engliſh polyglotts*, ארור אשר לא יקים את כל דברי התורה הזאת לעשותם maledictus, qui non permanſerit in *omnibus* verbis legis hujus, ut ea faciat; and to compare it with the verſion of the LXX επικαταρατος πας ανθρωπος, ος ουκ εμμενει εν πασι τοις λογοις του νομου τουτου ποιησαι αυτους, maledictus *omnis* homo, qui non permanet in *omnibus* verbis hujus legis, ut ea faciat; or with St. Pauls quotation επικαταρατος πας, ος ουκ εμμενει εν πασι τοις γεγραμμενοις εν τω βιβλιω του νομου, του ποιησαι αυτα, maledictus *omnis*, qui non permanet in *omnibus*, quæ ſcripta ſunt in libro legis, ut ea faciat. The LXX and St. Paul have πας *omnis* and πασι *omnibus*. In the Samaritan text there is כל *omnibus*; and ſo there is in the Samaritan verſion, ארור דלא יקים ית כל מלי אורתותה הדה למעבדנון But, notwithſtanding you affirm, that this text and verſion in the French and Engliſh polyglotts read כל *omnis*, and are ſo much ſurprized, that Cellarius ſhould affirm the direct contrary, yet the fact is, that כל *omnis* is not to be found in either of them.

The ſubject of Levit. xviii. 29, is not the ſame with Deut. xxvii. 26; but the conſtruction is ſuch, as will help to explain the meaning of Cellarius. In the former we read כי כל אשר יעשה מכל התועבת האלה quoniam *omnis*, qui faciet ex *omnibus* abominationibus

tionibus iſtis &c: where we find both כל *omnis* and כל *omnibus*. In the latter we read in both polyglotts, as above, ארור אשר לא יקים את כל דברי התורה הזאת לעשותם maledictus, qui non permanſerit in *omnibus* verbis legis hujus, ut ea faciat: here we find כל *omnibus* indeed; but you muſt have better eyes, than Cellarius or I, if you can find כל *omnis*.

Whether the Samaritan MSS read כל *omnis* in this place, I know not; becauſe I have never ſeen any of them. But we have no reaſon to think, that your account of the reading in them is more accurate than your account of the reading in the French and Engliſh polyglotts: eſpecially as you do not intimate, that there is in this place any difference between the reading in the polyglotts and the reading in the MSS.

If I am not much miſtaken; Jerom himſelf did not find כל *omnis* in the Samaritan MSS, which he examined. He looked for כל *omnis* et *in omnibus*; that is, he expected to have found כל twice in the Samaritan pentateuch; as there is πας ανθρωπος *omnis homo* and εν πασι τοις λογοις *in omnibus verbis* in the LXX verſion. But he ſeems to have found it only once: for he does not ſay, inveni כל *omnis* et in *omnibus*; but inveni כל quod [apoſtolus] interpretatur *omnis* ſive *omnibus* ſcriptum eſſe. He adds indeed — et cum LXX interpretibus concordare — and thus far the French and Engliſh polyglotts do agree with the LXX verſion, that they read כל *in omnibus*. If thoſe MSS, which Jerom examined, had agreed with this verſion any farther, I am perſuaded, that inſtead of telling his readers, that he found כל *omnis* ſive *omnibus*, he would have told them, that he found, what he looked for, כל *omnis* et *omnibus*.

If any one ſhould aſk, whether, ſuppoſing the Samaritan MSS, which Jerom ſaw, to have read, as the French and Engliſh polyglotts do, ארור אשר לא יקים את כל דברי התורה הזאת לעשותם it was poſſible for him to doubt, whether the word כל anſwered

ſwered to πας *omnis* or to πασι *omnibus* in the apoſtles quotation? I might aſk him in return; whether, before he ſaw your book, he could have thought it poſſible for you to affirm, that there is כל *omnis* in this paſſage? — Since therefore you could make this miſtake in oppoſition to plain eye-ſight; why might not ſuch a doubt ariſe in the mind of Jerom, as the leaſt attention to the moſt common rules of conſtruction would have corrected? — But perhaps Jerom, though he had no doubt about the matter, might ſpeak doubtfully, in order to make the Samaritan pentateuch and his abilities to conſult it appear the more important. When St. Paul, had uſed the words πας and πασι in this place of his epiſtle to the Galatians; and Jerom ſearched the Samaritan pentateuch to find כל *omnis* et *omnibus*; it might have diminiſhed the importance of this pentateuch, and of his own knowledge of the Samaritan alphabet, if he had told us plainly, that he found only one of them: but by ſaying, that he found כל quod (apoſtolus) interpretatur *omnis* ſive *omnibus*, he might poſſibly miſlead ſome of his readers to think, that he found both; eſpecially if he added what is true, though it is not the whole truth, that the Samaritan copy agrees with the LXX verſion. The event has anſwered: for you imagine, that כל *omnis* was in the MSS, which he examined; and Cellarius, if he did not think, that it was there, yet thought at leaſt, that Jerom ſays ſo. However; if Cellarius believed, upon what he ſuppoſed to be Jeroms teſtimony, that כל *omnis* was in theſe MSS, his miſtake ſtopped here: for he ſaw plainly, that in the preſent books it is not either in the verſion or in the text of the Samaritans, and therefore ſays — [b] Hieronymus in Galat. iii. 10. ſcribit in Samaritano codice, Deuteron. xxvii. 29. [26.] inveniri כל *omnis*, ut cum LXX interpretibus conveniat: verum abeſt *illud* כל ab hodiernis libris tam Samaritice verſis quam Ebræo-Samaritanis. But this ſuppoſed

[b] Collect. hiſt. Samar. pag. 45.

poſed teſtimony of Jerom dazzled your eyes ſo much, as to make you think, that you ſaw כל *omnis* in the French and Engliſh polyglotts, where no one elſe can find it.

As כל *omnibus* is in the Samaritan copies of the pentateuch, and not in the Hebrew; you may poſſibly aſk, whether this evidence, when it is joined to that of St. Paul, who writes εν πασι, where he refers to this paſſage, is not ſufficient to prove, what you deſigned to prove by it, that the Jews have wilfully corrupted the Scriptures at leaſt in one inſtance; notwithſtanding כל *omnis* does not ſeem to have been in either of them in Jeroms time, and certainly is not at preſent in the printed copies either of the Samaritan text or verſion? But this queſtion is nothing to the purpoſe of our preſent enquiry, which is, not whether the Jews have wilfully corrupted their pentateuch in this place? but whether you have given your readers an accurate account of the reading in the French and Engliſh polyglotts; when, though כל *omnis* is not to be found in the Samaritan text or verſion in either of them, you affirm that this text and verſion have it in them both?

In regard however to the other enquiry, I ſee plainly, that St. Paul, Galat. iii. 10. did not quote the LXX verſion of Deut. xxvii. 26. For in this epiſtle we read πας — τοις γεγραμμενοις εν τω βιβλιω τυ νομυ — τυ ποιησαι αυτα. — In the LXX verſion we read πας ανθρωπος — τοις λογοις — τυ νομυ τυτυ without εν τω βιβλιω — ποιησαι αυτυς. It is as plain, that he did not deſign to give a literal tranſlation either of the Samaritan or of the Hebrew text; not only becauſe he uſes the word πας, whereas כל πας is not in either of them; but becauſe neither of them have any word, to which εν τω βιβλιω can anſwer, and likewiſe becauſe τοις γεγραμμενοις is not a literal verſion of דברי which we read in both. We may therefore conclude, that he deſigned only to give the ſenſe of Deut. xxvii. 26. And they muſt be very ignorant or very perverſe

verſe interpreters, who do not ſee, that what we read in the Hebrew copy of the pentateuch ארור אשר לא יקים את דברי התורה הזאת לעשות אותם though there is neither כל *omnis* nor כל *omnibus* in it, has the ſame meaning, as what we read in St. Paul, επικαταρατος πας, ος ουκ εμμενει εν πασι τοις γεγραμμενοις εν τω βιβλιω του νομου, του ποιησαι αυτα.

When the apoſtles authority is thus out of the queſtion; there is no more reaſon to think, that the Jews have deſignedly omitted כל *omnibus* in their pentateuch, than that the Samaritans have deſignedly inſerted it into theirs. Unleſs you will make uſe of the authority of the LXX to confirm the genuineneſs of the Samaritan reading. But this authority will prove too much for your purpoſe: for there is in the LXX πας *omnis* as well as πασι *omnibus*. Therefore if this verſion will prove, that the Jews have wilfully corrupted their pentateuch by leaving out כל *omnis* and כל *omnibus*, it will likewiſe prove, that the Samaritans have wilfully corrupted theirs by leaving out כל *omnis*. Your purpoſe, was to ſhew, that the Jews were more likely to corrupt their pentateuch, Deut. xxvii. 4. by putting Ebal inſtead of Gerizim, than the Samaritans to corrupt theirs by putting Gerizim inſtead of Ebal; becauſe the Jews have been guilty of a wilful corruption, Deut. xxvii. 26. But if the Samaritans have been guilty of wilfully corrupting the very ſame paſſage, your argument comes to nothing.

" The preſent Hebrew text tells us, you ſay, that " [a] Jonathan, whom the Danites, when they pub- " licly eſtabliſhed idolatry, appointed to be their " prieſt, was *the ſon of Gerſhom the ſon of Manaſſeh.* " But we know that Gerſhom was the ſon of Moſes; " and there are ſtrong reaſons for believing, that the " word here was at firſt משה Moſes, and not מנשה " Manaſſeh." You then go on to produce thoſe reaſons. I need not tranſcribe them all; becauſe

I

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 51, &c. Judg. xviii. 30.

I am willing to allow you, what you want to prove by them, that the letter נ has been deſignedly added in this place by the Jews, in order to change Moſes into Manaſſeh. But I ſhall ſhew preſently, that the Samaritans have likewiſe introduced a plain corruption into their pentateuch in ſeveral places in the xiith and ſome other chapters of Deuteronomy. And ſince, as I ſhall then farther ſhew, this corruption introduced by the Samaritans is cloſely connected with the corruption at Deut. xxvii. 4, about which we are enquiring; whereas the addition of the letter נ in the book of Judges, which you charge upon the Jews, has plainly no connection with it; from comparing theſe two corruptions one in Deuteronomy xiith, the other in Judges xviiith, together, we may reaſonably conclude, that the Samaritans are more likely than the Jews to have been the authors of the third.

But there is one of your arguments, which I muſt not paſs by [b]. "The true reading of Judg. xviii. 30, "may, you ſay, be eaſily determined by the nature "of the place, and from the honeſt confeſſion of the "Jews themſelves. For ſtruck with deep concern "for the honour of their lawgiver, and diſtreſſed, "that a grandſon of Moſes ſhould be the firſt prieſt "of idolatry, they have ventured it ſeems upon a "pious fraud, placing over the word משה the letter נ "which might intimate it to be Manaſſeh. —You "then ſet forth the fate of this ſuperpoſititious letter, "as you call it, ſometimes it is placed over the word, "ſometimes ſuſpended half way, and ſometimes uni-"formly inſerted: In the next page you add another "variation — it is ſometimes magnified to double the "common ſize. And here you tell us, that *in the* "*greater number of copies* it is (in your way of ſpeak-"ing) *ſuſpended* between heaven and earth, that "*there are others*, in which it is monſtrouſly *magnified*, "and that *in ſome copies*, written as well as printed, it *wears*

[b] Diſſ. 2. pag. 52. 53.

" *wears the exact garb of the genuine letters.* And all " this; even though ſome of the honeſter rabbies have " aſſured us, that the *Nun* has no right to a place in " that word, *having been added* by their fathers, to " take away this great reproach from the name and " family of Moſes. In proof of which you cite the " following words of R. Solomon Jarchi, who lived " about 650 years ago — Propter honorem Moſis " ſcripta fuit *(litera)* Nun, ut nomen mutaretur; et " quidem ſcripta fuit ſuſpenſa, ad indicandum, quod " non fuerit Menaſſes, ſed Moſes." — So that becauſe in moſt of the copies the Jews have taken care, Judg. xviii. 30, to ſhew that the *Nun* is not genuine, by placing it above the line, and in others by magnifying it to double the common ſize, whilſt only ſome few tranſcribers have been ignorant or careleſs enough to omit theſe marks; and becauſe the rabbies, when they have occaſion to ſpeak of this paſſage, are ſo honeſt as to inform us, that this letter has been added to the text; you would conclude, that the Jews were the corrupters of Deut. xxvii. 4, where no mark, that the word עיבל [Ebal] is not genuine, has been found in any Hebrew copy, and where no rabbi has ever ſaid, that there is a corruption. A plain man would have been likely to have argued, on the contrary, that ſince the Jews, where they have corrupted the ſacred books, are ſo honeſt as to give us notice of it, we have reaſon to believe, that they have not corrupted them, where they have given us no notice.

The writer in the monthly pamphlet referred to [c] above, who calls himſelf *Philalethes*, by which name I ſhall call him hereafter, whenever I have occaſion to mention him in this letter, has pointed out this concluſion to you. For when you ſay — " Here then we " have the Jews convicted of wilful corruption, upon " the moſt notorious of all evidences, their own con- " feſſion;" — he replies, [d] " To me they appear, on " the

[c] See pag. 1.

" the contrary, to inſinuate, that, whatever fooliſh " conceit led them to add *Nun*, care was taken to " ſhew every reader, that it was not genuine." But becauſe he had happened to ſay juſt [e] before, that this letter hath *never*, when he ſhould have ſaid, hath *ſeldom*, been put upon a level with the other letters; and becauſe he had not quoted as much from Michaelis as you have; though what you have quoted relates chiefly to the opinion of Michaelis and does not at all affect the truth of this concluſion; [f] you lay hold of theſe two trifles and raiſe a duſt with them, by which, you might perhaps prevent yourſelf, but can ſcarce prevent your readers, from ſeeing what is the proper concluſion from the facts, which you have ſtated.

Whilſt you are ſupporting your charge againſt the Jews of wilfully corrupting the text of the old teſtament, [g] you deſire it may not be forgotten, " that St. " Jerom commenting on the celebrated prophecy in " Micah v. 2. takes notice of the eleven cities, which " are mentioned in the verſion of the LXX, but not " in the preſent Heb. text, at Joſh. xv, 60. Θεκω, και " Εφραθα (αυλη εστι Βηθλεεμ) και Φαγωρ, και Αιταμ, και " Κυλον, και Ταϊαμι, και Σωρης, και Καρεμ, και Γαλλιμ, " και Βαιθηρ, και Μανοχω, πολεις ενδεκα, και αι κωμαι " αυλων. Theſe cities he thinks, *may have been* omitted " by the antient Jews out of malice to chriſtianity, " becauſe Bethlehem-Ephratah, the place of Chriſts " nativity is one of theſe cities, and is deſcribed as in " the tribe of Judah. Dr. Wall ſuppoſes this omiſſion " to have been occaſioned by the ſame word וחצריהן " *and their villages* occurring immediately before and " at the end of the words thus omitted, —and thinks " it the leſs likely, that the Jews ſhould *deſignedly* " omit Bethlehem here, becauſe that place is mention- " ed as belonging to Judah in ſeveral other parts of " Scripture. But then you obſerve, that though Bethle-

" hem

[d] Library &c. N°. iv. pag. 206. [e] pag. 205.

[f] Library &c. N°. v. pag. 263. [g] Diff. 2. pag. 57.

" hem is elſewhere mentioned as belonging to Judah,
" yet (you believe) Bethlehem-Ephratah is no where
" mentioned in that manner, excepting here and in the
" prophecy of Micah before referred to. And there-
" fore, though you allow, that this remarkable omiſ-
" ſion was probably owing at firſt to ſome tranſcribers
" miſtake, yet you think, that its not being re-in-
" ſerted might be owing to the reaſon ſpecified by
" St. Jerom," —Suppoſing now the fact to be true, which you alledge, that Bethlehem-Ephratah is no where elſe mentioned as belonging to Judah, except here and in the prophecy of Micah; could this be a ſufficient reaſon to conclude, that the Jews out of malice to chriſtianity continued a corruption here, which was firſt made accidentally? It could not hurt chriſtianity to ſuppreſs in this paſſage the mention of Bethlehem-Ephratah as belonging to Judah, whilſt it continued to be ſo mentioned in the very prophecy, which chriſtians make uſe of to prove this to be the proper place of the birth of the Meſſiah. And unluckily for your concluſion, when St. Matthew relates the anſwer, which the chief prieſts and ſcribes made to Herods enquiry, where Chriſt ſhould be born; the nicety of calling this place Bethlehem-Ephratah is not attended to: for his words are —[c] " when he [Herod] had gathered all the chief prieſts and ſcribes of the people together, he demanded of them, where Chriſt ſhould be born. And they ſaid unto him in *Bethlehem of Judea:* for thus it is written in the prophet; And thou *Bethlehem in the land of Juda*, art not the leaſt among the princes of Juda; for out of thee ſhall come a governour, that ſhall rule my people Iſrael."—If you had attended to this, you might have underſtood, that the Jews could never ſuppoſe the mentioning of Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, under the preciſe form of Bethlehem-Ephratah, to be of any importance to chriſtianity.

Having

[c] Matt. ii. 4. 5. 6.

Having thus ſhewn, that if the fact, which you alledge, was true, it would not juſtify your concluſion: I will next examine the fact itſelf. You ſay, "that though Bethlehem is elſewhere mentioned as "belonging to Judah, yet, you believe, Bethlehem-"Ephratah is no where mentioned in that manner, "excepting *here* and in the prophecy of Micah."— But you might have found ſomething very like it; 1 Sam. xvii. 12. where it is ſaid, that "David was the "ſon of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whoſe "name was Jeſſe." And if that Bethlehem, the inhabitants of which were called Ephrathites, was in the tribe of Judah; no one could be at a loſs to know which tribe Bethlehem-Ephratah belonged to; whatever became of the names of thoſe eleven cities in the book of Joſhua.

Perhaps you may reply, that I ought not to have quoted this verſe of Samuel, in a diſpute with you: [a] becauſe you look upon it as an interpolation. But this is the very reaſon, why I choſe to quote it; when I might otherwiſe as well have quoted Ruth i. 2. where Mahlon and Chilion are called Ephrathites of Bethlehem-Judah. For you muſt allow; either that the Jews did not make that interpolation, which you ſuppoſe to have been made in the book of Samuel; or elſe that they did not out of malice to chriſtianity continue to omit the mention of Bethlehem-Ephratah among the cities of Judah in the book of Joſhua, which had been caſually omitted at firſt. Unleſs you have the Jewiſh tranſcribers of the bible ſo much at your command, that you can at any time make them omit or interpolate whatever you pleaſe.

Your obſervation, at the concluſion of this article, in which you have endeavoured to fix on the Jews the charge of wilfully corrupting the Scriptures, muſt not be paſſed over. "[b] You ſay, that Dean Prideaux thought "it poſſible for the Jews to be guilty of what he calls a "plain

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 423.
[b] Diſ. 2. pag. 58. Connection &c. P. ii. B. iv. pag. 264. 265. 266.

" plain corrupting of the text: and he expreſsly charges " them with wilfully corrupting the Greek verſion of " Iſaiah xix. 18."

It may be worth the while to lay this matter before the reader, as we find it in Prideaux. " Onias, " who, on his being diſappointed of the high-prieſt- " hood on the death of his uncle Menelaus, fled into " Egypt,—by his power and intereſt with Ptolemy " Philometor obtained licenſe to build a temple for " the Jews in Egypt like that at Jeruſalem, with a " grant for him and his deſcendants to be always " high-prieſts in it:—a very learned man is of opinion, " that he was led to the choice of the prefecture of " Heliopolis for the erecting of his temple in it by " the following prophecy of Iſaiah—[c] *In that day ſhall* " *five cities in the land of Egypt ſpeak the language of* " *Canaan, and ſwear to the Lord of Hoſts. One ſhall* " *be called the city of deſtruction. In that day ſhall there* " *be an altar unto the Lord in the midſt of the land* " *of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof unto the* " *Lord:*—for he thinks, that the reading in the He- " brew text was then *Hacheres* and not *Haberes:* " as if inſtead of *Air haberes yeamer Leæchath, one* " *ſhall be called the city of deſtruction,* as in our " Engliſh tranſlation, the reading then was *Air ha-* " *cheres yeamer Leæchath, one ſhall be called the city of* " *the Sun,* that is, Heliopolis. And ſo much muſt " be ſaid for this conceit, that in the Hebrew alpha- " bet the letter ח *ch* and the letter ה *h* are ſo much " alike, that they may by tranſcribers very eaſily be " miſtaken the one for the other, and thereby a va- " rious reading be made in that place."

Hitherto he has brought no charge againſt the Jews of plainly corrupting the text in tranſcribing it: he only allows it to be poſſible, that a various reading ſhould have been produced by an accidental miſtake of one letter for another very like it.—But he goes on—" In favour of this temple of Onias the LXX

[c] xix. 18. 19.

" LXX render the paſſage of Iſaiah above-mention-
" ed πολις Ασεδεκ κληθησεται μια πολις, *one of the cities*
" *ſhall be called Aſedek*, intimating thereby, as if
" the original were, neither *air Haberes*, nor *air Ha-*
" *cheres*, but *air Hazzedek*, the city of righteouſneſs;
" *which is a plain corrupting of the text* to make it
" ſpeak for the honour and approbation of the tem-
" ple of Onias, which was there built."

Thus we find, that his thinking it poſſible for the Jews to be guilty of *what he calls a plain corrupting of the text*; *and his expreſly charging them with wilfully corrupting the Greek verſion of Iſaiah* xix. 18. though in your repreſentation they appear to be two things, are in reality one and the ſame. You will pleaſe therefore to obſerve, that he charges them with plainly corrupting the text, not in tranſcribing it, but in tranſlating it: from whence it may follow, that the Greek verſion is of leſs authority in correcting the Hebrew text, than you ſometimes repreſent it to be; but it will not follow, that in the opinion of Prideaux the Jews have wilfully corrupted the Hebrew text, which we have received through their hands. You may obſerve farther, that thoſe Jews, whom he thought capable of wilfully corrupting the text, were ſuch as had joined themſelves to a ſchiſmatical temple, and had deſerted the temple of Jeruſalem: and I am ready to allow, that all Jews in the ſame circumſtances were capable of corrupting, and were likely to corrupt, their bible, in order to introduce ſomething into it, which might appear to juſtify their unhallowed worſhip, and ſupport the honour of their temple. Manaſſeh and the renegado Jews, who worſhipped at Gerizim in oppoſition to Jeruſalem, were in theſe circumſtances; and ſuch a corruption, as they are charged with introducing, Deut. xxvii. 4, would ſerve for this purpoſe.

I may call the temple on mount Gerizim and the worſhip, which was performed there, *ſchiſmatical*, without taking the queſtion, which is now before us, for granted: becauſe whether this mountain, or Ebal,

was the place where the Iſraelites, by Gods command, were to build an altar upon their entrance into the land of Canaan; the ſcriptures certainly inform us, that [d] Jeruſalem was the place, which God had choſen to put his name there, long before Sanballat and Manaſſeh built their temple. And conſequently Jeruſalem was the place, at which the law of Moſes obliged the Iſraelites to perform their publick worſhip.

We have now conſidered the particulars, by which you endeavour to ſupport Whiſtons charge againſt the Jews. Let us next enquire on the other hand, whether the Samaritans have not plainly corrupted their pentateuch Deut. xii. 5. — "[e] Unto the place which the Lord thy God [יִבְחַר Heb.] *ſhall chuſe* [בחר Samar. *hath choſen*] to put his name there, even unto his habitation ſhall ye ſeek, and thither thou ſhalt come, and thither ye ſhall bring your burnt-offerings and your ſacrifices, and your tithes, and heave-offerings of your hands, and your vows and your free-will-offerings, and the firſtlings of your herds and of your flocks." — There are in the book of Deuteronomy at leaſt 20 paſſages, in which this place, where God would put his name, is ſpoken of: and in all of them the Hebrew copy has יִבְחַר *ſhall chuſe*, and the Samaritan copy has בחר *hath choſen*. So that, according to the Hebrew copy, this place was to be choſen in ſome future time: according to the Samaritan copy, the choice was already made, when Moſes wrote this book.

Our tranſlators, for what reaſon I know not, have rendered Deut. xii. 21, thus — "If the place which the Lord thy God *hath choſen* &c". The word in this paſſage, as well as in the other, which I have quoted at large, and in all the reſt, which are of the ſame import,

[d] 1 Kings viii. 10. 11. 48. ix. 3. 2 Chron. vi. 38. vii. 1. 2. 1 Kings xi. 32. 1 Chron. xxi. 28. xxii. 1. Jerem. xxv. 29. Pſalm cxxii. 1. — 9. lxxviii. 67. 68. cxxxii. 13. Zech. iii. 2. Matt. v. 35. xxiii. 21.

[e] Deut. xii. 5. 11. &c. xvi. 16. &c.

port, though it is בחר *hath choſen* in the Samaritan pentateuch, is יבחר *ſhall chuſe* in the Hebrew. Certainly when a future deſignation is ſpoken of in other inſtances, the Samaritan copy, as well as the Hebrew, uſes a future tenſe, and not a præter.—Thus Num. xvi. 7. "And it ſhall be, that the man, whom the Lord [יבחר Heb. and Sam.] *ſhall chuſe* &c". — Num. xvii. 5. "And it ſhall come to paſs, that the man whom I [אבחר Heb. and Samar.] *ſhall chuſe*".— Deut. xvii. 15. "Thou ſhalt in any wiſe ſet him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God [יבחר Heb. and Samar.] *ſhall chuſe.*"

Was then Jeruſalem the place, which God choſe to put his name there, or was it not? If this was not the place; [f] the Jews muſt have corrupted the old teſtament from one end to the other; nay, they muſt have corrupted the goſpel of St. Matthew, in which our Saviour declares Jeruſalem to be the city of the Great King, and the temple there to be his habitation. If Jeruſalem was the place; the Samaritans muſt have corrupted their pentateuch: for according to their reading God had choſen the place, where he would put his name, before Moſes wrote the book of Deuteronomy; and yet there is not throughout the whole pentateuch the leaſt intimation, that he would put his name at Jeruſalem, and make it the peculiar place of his worſhip.

You will ſay perhaps, that long before the time of either Solomon, who firſt built the temple of God, or of David, in whoſe reign the place for building it [g] was pointed out, there was a choſen place of worſhip; though till that time it was ambulatory, and went along with the tabernacle. If you could prove, that, till the temple was built, the place, where the Lord would put his name, meant nothing elſe but the tabernacle itſelf, and did not include the place or ſpot of ground, on which this tabernacle ſhould be pitched; this would be to your purpoſe: becauſe

[f] See the references at note [d]

[g] 1 Chron. xxii 28. xxii. 1, &c.

cauſe upon this ſuppoſition Moſes, as ſoon as the tabernacle was made, might properly ſpeak in this manner, — "Unto the place, which the Lord *hath choſen*, ye ſhall bring your burnt-offerings &c." — But it will be in vain for you to think of proving this: — for Moſes writes — "[h] Unto the place, which the Lord your God *ſhall chuſe* [the Samar. reading is *hath choſen*] *out of all your tribes* to put his name there; even unto his habitation ſhall ye ſeek. — Take heed to thyſelf, that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place, that thou ſeeſt: but in the place, which the Lord ſhall chuſe, [the Samar. reading is, *hath choſen*] *out of all your tribes*, there thou ſhalt offer thy burnt-offerings, and there thou ſhalt do all that I command thee." — From hence it appears plainly, that the place, where God would put his name, could not conſiſt of the tabernacle itſelf: becauſe it was to be a place *in one of their tribes*; and conſequently ſome ſpot of ground in the land of Canaan was included in the notion of it.

But upon the authority of Jeremiah, vii. 12, where God calls Shiloh, which was the place, where the tabernacle ſtood in the days of Joſhua, — *the place where he ſet his name at the firſt*, — I readily allow, that, before the temple was built by Solomon, the tabernacle and that ſpot of ground, on which it ſhould happen to be erected, was what Moſes meant by the place, where the Lord would put his name. But ſtill I affirm, that the Samaritan reading בחר *hath choſen* muſt be a corruption: for as the place, where the temple ſhould be built, was not appointed and ſettled, when Moſes wrote the book of Deuteronomy; ſo neither had there at that time been any appointment of the place or places, where the tabernacle ſhould be pitched in the land of Canaan.

Thus the Samaritans *are convicted of wilfully corrupting the pentateuch:* for it is ſcarce poſſible to imagine, that the word יִבְחַר *ſhall chuſe* has in their pentateuch been changed, in ſo many inſtances, into the word בחר *hath choſen*, merely by accident. What you may be

[h] Deut. xii. 5. 13. 14.

be able to plead in arreſt of judgment from your future collations, I know not. But as the ſeveral paſſages in the book of Deuteronomy, which mention the place, where the Lord would put his name, are of great importance; I would recommend to you to be more careful in examining the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS in theſe paſſages, than you were in examining the French and Engliſh polyglotts, when you ſuppoſed them to read כל *omnis* Deut. xxvii. 26.

Indeed, if the Samaritans ſhould employ you to defend their general character, you have ſomething to offer in their favour. It would interrupt the preſent argument, if I was to enquire here, whether your defence is of any weight or not: but I will be ſure to take due notice of it; when I come to Mr. Whiſtons fourth argument.

The corruption, which I have been charging upon the Samaritans, is of the more importance; becauſe, as I hinted [i] above, it is connected with the queſtion, which we are now examining; Whether they or the Jews corrupted Deut. xxvii. 4, they by putting Gerizim inſtead of Ebal, or the Jews on the contrary by putting Ebal inſtead of Gerizim? The reader will ſee this connection, if he will attend to the following obſervations. Moſes has no where mentioned Jeruſalem as the appointed place of Gods public worſhip. If therefore the place, where the Lord would put his name, was choſen before the book of Deuteronomy was written; the conſequence would be, that Jeruſalem could not be the place. This is one advantage, which the Samaritans would gain by changing יִבְחַר *ſhall chuſe* into בָּחַר *hath choſen*. But this is not all. It is agreed, that either the Jews or the Samaritans have wilfully corrupted Deut. xxvii. 4. Now the Samaritans by changing Ebal into Gerizim in this paſſage, if they introduced no other corruption into the pentateuch, could only make their temple appear the more venerable, as being built in the place, where God by

[i] pag. 13.

by Moſes had commanded the Iſraelites to build an altar, and to worſhip him at their entrance into Canaan: they could not argue from hence, that this was the place, were the Lord deſigned to put his name, and where all the future worſhip of this people was to be performed. But if at the ſame time they changed יִבְחַר *ſhall chuſe* into בָּחַר *hath choſen* in all the paſſages, in which Moſes ſpeaks of the place, where the Lord would put his name; theſe two corruptions taken together might ſerve to lead thoſe, who looked no farther than the law of Moſes, into a perſuaſion, that Gerizim was the appointed place for the temple of God. For if God, when Moſes wrote the book of Deuteronomy, had already choſen the ſtanding place of worſhip in the land of Canaan; and if Gerizim was the place, where he had commanded the Iſraelites to build an altar, as ſoon as they were entered into this land; the obvious concluſion would be, that Gerizim was by his appointment the ſtanding place of worſhip: becauſe throughout the whole pentateuch, according to the Samaritan copy, there is no mention of any place in the land of Canaan, where God had expreſly appointed any altar to be built or any ſacrifices to be offered by the children of Iſrael, beſides Gerizim.—Since ſuch a purpoſe, as this, might be anſwered by theſe two corruptions; and ſince we are ſure, that the Samaritans corrupted the pentateuch in one of theſe inſtances, who do you think corrupted it in the other?

You and I indeed can prove, that Jeruſalem, and not Gerizim, was the place, which God choſe for his temple; whether the reading, Deut. xxvii. 4, is Gerizim or Ebal. But then we prove it from the other books of the old teſtament, and not from the pentateuch: and the Samaritans took as much care as they could to keep this evidence out of ſight; for [k] "they received none "other ſcriptures, than the five books of Moſes, re-"jecting all the other books, which are in the Jew-"iſh canon."

And

[k] Prideauxs connection &c. P. i. B. vi. pag. 416.

And this, by the way, ſeems to be a very material conſideration in favour of my opinion. For if you had clearly convicted the Jews of having corrupted the Scriptures in the ſeveral inſtances, which we have been examining; you would not have had ſo good reaſon to infer from thence, that they were the corrupters of Deut. xxvii. 4, as there is to infer, that it was corrupted by the Samaritans, from their not admitting the authority of thoſe books, in which the ſtrongeſt evidence imaginable againſt the divine deſignation of their temple is contained. For thoſe other corruptions, with which you charge the Jews, have no connection with this at Deut. xxvii. 4. But the deſire of doing honour to the temple of Gerizim, which probably had great weight in preventing the Samaritans from receiving any other books of the old teſtament, beſides the pentateuch, connects their not admitting the divine authority of thoſe books with the corruption now in queſtion.

The next argument produced by [1] Mr. Whiſton in favour of the Samaritan reading, Deut. xxvii. 4, is — "That it ſeems moſt agreeable to the nature of "things, that the altar for divine worſhip and ſacri"fice, as well as the inſcription of laws, which is "here concerned, ſhould be at the mountain of bleſ"ſings, as Gerizim was, and not at that appointed "for the curſes as was Ebal." — I cannot call it his argument, becauſe [m] others had uſed it before him. But as it certainly is not yours, though you uſe it [n] without owning, where you had it; I ſhould have paſſed it over; if I had not promiſed, whilſt I was pointing out ſome inſtances of your injudiciouſneſs and inaccuracy, to examine, whether Gerizim or Ebal was the mount of the altar.

I have not been able to find any reaſon to think, that either ſolemn curſes, or ſolemn bleſſings were in

[1] Eſſay &c. pag. 169.

[m] Baſnage. L. ii. c. i. S. 25. See Maundrell pag. 60. Procop. Gaz. in notis Bernard. ad Joſeph. Antiq. L. iv. c. viii. S. 45.

[n] Diſ. 2 pag. 32.

in the times of Moſes underſtood to be connected with the place, on which the perſons ſtood, who delivered them. The curſes, which they denounced, neither indicated this place to have been accurſed before, nor rendered it accurſed for the future: and the bleſſings, which they proclaimed, were no marks, that this place either was at that time, or ſhould be for the future, particularly favoured of God. On the contrary; the curſes or the bleſſings were to befall thoſe perſons or thoſe places, on which the eyes of him, who pronounced them, were fixed, or towards which he turned his face. Thus ° Balaam, whilſt he bleſſed the Iſraelites, ſtood on the top of Peor, and turned his eyes towards them. Afterwards, without going from thence, he turned himſelf toward the Amalekites, and "looking on them he took up his parable and ſaid, Amalek was the firſt of the nations, but his latter end ſhall be, that he periſh for ever: and then looking on the Kenites he ſaid, ſtrong is thy dwelling place, and thou putteſt thy neſt in a rock; nevertheleſs the Kenite ſhall be waſted, until Aſhur ſhall carry thee away captive." We cannot ſay, that theſe bleſſings and curſes had any relation to the place, from which they were pronounced: becauſe to ſay this, would be to make the top of Peor both a bleſſed and an accurſed place. And indeed it is obvious to every reader, that the bleſſings and the curſes related not to Peor; but that the former related to the Iſraelites, and the latter to the Amalekites and the Kenites, towards whom he reſpectively looked, whilſt he proclaimed them. In like manner amongſt the Jews in later times, when Ezekiel was to prophecy againſt the foreſt of the ſouth-field, he was ordered to ſet his face [דרך תימנה] towards the ſouth.

The perſons, who were to be affected by the bleſſings or by the curſes proclaimed on Gerizim and Ebal, were indeterminate: the former belonged to thoſe, who ſhould obey the law of God; and the latter to thoſe, who

° Num. xxiii. 28. xxiv. 2. 20. 21. 22. Ezek. xx. 46. [in the Heb. xxi. 2.]

who ſhould diſobey it. But as theſe two parties could not then be ſeparated from one another; the ſix tribes, which denounced the curſes, could not look upon thoſe perſons in particular, on whom theſe curſes were to fall; or the other ſix tribes, on thoſe, who were to enjoy the bleſſings, which they promiſed. Nor would I have the reader underſtand me to ſuppoſe, that in all ſolemn bleſſings or curſings this rule was at all times obſerved, that whoever pronounced them directed his eyes, or turned his face, towards thoſe perſons or places, which were to be affected by them. By the examples of Balaam and Ezekiel I deſigned only to ſhew, that if at any time the poſition of the body of him, who proclaimed curſes or bleſſings, pointed out the perſons or places, to which they reſpectively related; this was done by the direction of his eyes or the turn of his face. In the preſent caſe, as I juſt now obſerved, the poſition neither of the ſix tribes, which bleſſed the people, nor of the other ſix, which curſed them, could be deſigned to point out the perſons, to whom the bleſſings and the curſes belonged. It is enough for my purpoſe, if I have ſhewn, that, as far as we can judge from analogy, neither the bleſſings nor the curſes had any relation to the places, from which they were proclaimed; and that ſince the ſix tribes, which were ſtationed on Ebal, looked towards Gerizim, and the other ſix, which were ſtationed on Gerizim, looked towards Ebal, if you will ſuppoſe the bleſſings and the curſes proclaimed from theſe two mountains to have related to any place at all, the curſes denounced from Ebal muſt have related to Gerizim, and the bleſſings promiſed from Gerizim muſt have related to Ebal. In this view of the matter, Gerizim, on which in future times a ſchiſmatical temple was to be built, was the accurſed mountain; and Ebal, on which, according to the Hebrew copy of the pentateuch, the ſtones with the law engraven on them and the altar of God then ſtood, was the bleſſed one.

You may therefore if you pleaſe call [p] Gerizim, as Mr. Whiſton had called it before you, *the mount of the bleſſings*: for it was, as you explain yourſelf, the mount, from the top of which, or on the ſide of which, the bleſſings were to be proclaimed. And in a like ſenſe you may call Ebal *the mount of curſings*. But if you would infer from hence, that the former was in any reſpect, a bleſſed mount, as [q] the Samaritans call it, or the latter in any reſpect an accurſed one; this will not be true. Analogy might have led you to make the contrary inference, that Ebal was the bleſſed and Gerizim the accurſed mount. So that the proclaiming of the bleſſings from Gerizim, and of the curſes from Ebal, is either no reaſon, why we ſhould think, that the law and the altar were not on Ebal; or elſe it is a reaſon, why we ſhould think that they were there.

The only variation, which you have made in Mr. Whiſtons manner of ſtating this argument, creates no new difficulty. [r] "For though Ebal was con-" feſſedly the mount of curſing," yet if it was not by this means either declared to be, or rendered, an accurſed place, why "does it ſeem improbable, that "the ſacrificers of *peace-offerings*, which implied a "ſtate of *favour* with God, ſhould by divine com-"mand ſacrifice there"? For my own part I can ſee no inconſiſtency or impropriety in declaring to the people, that, if they diſobeyed Gods laws, they would loſe his favour and feel his diſpleaſure, from the ſame place, in which they had juſt been offering ſuch ſacrifices, as implied, that they were then in a ſtate of favour with him. And this was undoubtedly the whole import of the curſes, from whichever of the two mountains they were denounced: they did not put the people out of Gods favour, but only declared what would be the certain conſequence of their diſobedience. You might have argued as judiciouſly, that becauſe

[p] Diſſ. 2. pag. 33. [q] Reland. Diſſert. Miſcell. Par. i. p. 124.
[r] Diſſert. 2. pag. 33.

becauſe peace-offerings imply a ſtate of favour with God, it ſeems improbable, that theſe curſes ſhould by divine command have been denounced immediately after ſuch ſacrifices, as theſe, had been offered by the people. When you have tryed how well this concluſion, about the time of denouncing the curſes, agrees with Gods command, as it is recorded in both copies of the pentateuch; you will be able to judge, how far the other concluſion, about the place, from which they were denounced, affects the authority of the Hebrew copy.

Mr. Whiſtons third argument is, [s] "That this "ſeems to be the place [I preſume he means the "place of the altar and the law] where Joſhua ſet up "[t] *a ſtone for a witneſs* unto the Iſraelites, becauſe "as he ſpeaks, [u] *It had heard all the words of the Lord, "which he ſpake unto them:* which was expreſly at "Shechem, or cloſe by mount Gerizim, and not at "mount Ebal." This argument you make no uſe of, till you come to the ſupplemental part of your firſt chapter; where you produce it with a few additions of your own, but without any acknowledgment or intimation, that you had borrowed it from Whiſton, or even that *he had touched upon it*. Collins had ſaid, "[x] That the Jews, before the ſeparation of Iſrael from "Judah, ſeem never to have had the leaſt thought of "worſhiping at mount Gerizim." To this you reply, —[y] "'Tis remarkable, that the habitation appointed "to Joſhua in Canaan, was the city of [z] Timnath-"Serah in mount Ephraim; yet at the latter part of his "life we find him removed to Shechem, or at leaſt that "he went to Shechem, when he convened all Iſrael, to "give them his dying exhortation. But why exchange "his own city for Shechem, or why aſſemble all the "tribes at Shechem; eſpecially when the ark of God "was at Shilo; unleſs for the ſolemnity and conve-"nience

[s] Eſſay &c. pag. 169. [t] xxiv. 26. 27. [u] Diſſ. 2. pag. 116.
[x] Grounds and reaſons &c. 1741. pag. 166.
[y] Diſſ. 2. pag. 117. &c. [z] Joſh. xix. 50.

" nience derived from the altar and the law then up-
" on mount Gerizim?" You then quote the begin-
ning of the laſt chapter of Joſhua, where we read,
—" That Joſhua gathered all the tribes of Iſrael to
" Shechem, and called for the elders of Iſrael, their
" heads, their judges, and their officers; and they
" preſented themſelves before God — The meaning
" of which words, you ſay, ſeems clearly to be
" — that when the men of all the tribes were aſſem-
" bled in and around Shechem, to receive the laſt
" command of their victorious leader; he called the
" chiefs of all the tribes to himſelf upon Gerizim:
" where they preſented themſelves before the Lord,
" and offered ſacrifice on that mountain, which had
" been before conſecrated by the law and the altar,
" and probably ſacrificed upon *that very altar*, which
" Joſhua himſelf had erected there between 20 and
" 30 years before. God being worſhipped, Joſhua
" makes his laſt oration — and, as we read in the
" 25th and following verſes, he made a covenant
" with the people that day, and ſet them a ſtatute
" and an ordinance in Shechem. And Joſhua took a
" great ſtone, and ſet it up there, under an oak, that
" was by the ſanctuary of the Lord. And he ſaid,
" Behold, this ſtone ſhall be a witneſs; for it hath
" heard all the words of the Lord, which he ſpake
" unto us: it ſhall be therefore a witneſs unto you,
" leſt ye deny your God — Commentators have been
" greatly puzzled at the word במקדש [in ſanctuario,
" in loco ſancto] here rendered *by the ſanctuary.*
" The ark was not preſent; and if it had, the oak
" could not grow in the ark. But the oak might
" grow in or upon Gerizim, in or upon that *holy*
" place or mountain; and *there* Joſhua might with
" great propriety take ſome large ſtone, and ſet it up
" as a witneſs; making at the ſame time this ſtrik-
" ing remark — that the ſtone, thus ſet up, *had*
" *heard all the words of the Lord*, i. e. that very ſtone
" had been there, when the law of God was inſcribed,

and

" and read to the people, at their former ſolemn con-
" vention"

You have endeavoured to make all chriſtians afraid of contradicting any thing, which you ſay in this part of your book, by giving them notice, [a] juſt before you enter upon it, that they ſhould " learn to be extream-
" ly cautious — how they join with Mr. *Collins* in
" opinion upon *this article*" [that the Samaritans have corrupted their pentateuch.] And [b] elſewhere you tell us, " that you enter upon your enquiry," [about the authenticity of the Samaritan reading, Deut. xxvii. 4.]
" with the greater readineſs; becauſe it will enable
" you to confute one chapter, which has not yet been
" anſwered, in that famous book, *the grounds and*
" *reaſons of the chriſtian religion*; wrote by that great
" champion of infidelity, Anthony Collins Eſq. For
" this author in that work, ſo remarkably replete
" with malice againſt chriſtianity, has one whole chap-
" ter to prove the Samaritan pentateuch corrupted
" chiefly from the very text now under conſiderati-
" on." This ſcare-crow can only ſerve to terrify thoſe, who are not aware, that it is a common artifice with one ſort of polemical writers to guard a weak cauſe by endeavouring to fix upon the contrary opinion ſome odium, which does not belong to it. When your future diſſertation, on Exodus xxth. [c] is publiſhed, perhaps you may ſhew us, what no body can ſee at preſent, that the truth of chriſtianity is connected with the genuine-neſs of the Samaritan reading of Deut. xxvii. 4. In the mean time we have the leſs reaſon to be afraid of ſpeaking our ſentiments upon this ſubject; not only becauſe we have thoſe great men to countenance us, whoſe names I have tranſcribed, at page 5th, from your book; but becauſe, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, you have encouraged us by your own example to join in opinion with Collins, and even to uſe his arguments, where

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 102. [b] pag. 24.—
[c] Diſſ. 2. pag. 100. &c.

where his opinions and his arguments are ſuch, as do not appear to affect the truth of our religion.

The queſtions — Why did Joſhua " exchange his " own city for Shechem? or why aſſemble all the " tribes at Shechem; when the ark of God was at " Shilo? have often been aſked. The anſwer;—*That this was done for the ſolemnity and convenience derived from the altar and the law then upon mount Gerizim*;— as far as I know, was never thought of, till you ſuggeſted it.

You might have found another anſwer in the Vatican and likewiſe in the Alexandrian copy of the LXX: for in both of them the name of the place, where Joſhua aſſembled all the tribes, is not Συχεμ [Shechem or Sichem] but Σηλω [Silo or Shilo.] Any one elſe might tell me, that the word has probably been changed either by the tranſlators or by ſome tranſcriber, in order to avoid a difficulty, which they could not explain; and might quote what [e] Jerom ſays about the copyers of his days — " Scribunt non quod inveniunt, " ſed quod intelligunt; et dum alienos errores emendare " nituntur oſtendunt ſuos." But you cannot tell me this without being inconſiſtent with yourſelf. For in the firſt place, what Jerom ſays, points out to us a rule in criticiſm, which you found in a treatiſe *de judicio ſuper variis lectionibus codicis hebræi divini recte faciendo*, and which you ſeem to look upon as a very abſurd one. Your repreſentation of this rule is as follows.— " [f] The writer of this treatiſe tells us, — that in " Pſal. xxiv. 6. the Gr. Vulg. and Arab. verſions " give one reading, and the Syr. verſion another, " and both different from the preſent Hebrew — but " that neither of theſe readings can be true, becauſe " they are both *very intelligible*: whereas the reading " in the preſent Hebrew muſt be preferable, becauſe " it is *more difficult to be underſtood*. And if he was " not to determine thus, he ſays, he ſhould offend a- " gainſt a law of his own making; the meaning of " which is — that *a more difficult reading is ever to be pre-*

[e] Ad Lucin. Tom. iv. p. 578. [f] Diſſ. 2. 501.

" *preferred before a leſs difficult :* which, as he explains " it, is the ſame as to ſay — that a reading hard, " obſcure, and unintelligible is always to take place of " what is eaſy, clear, and ſatisfactory, i. e. light is " leſs eligible than darkneſs, and ſenſe than nonſenſe."

I have never ſeen this treatiſe and therefore am not ſure, whether he calls it *a rule of his own making*, or whether this is only your pleaſant way of repreſenting the matter. How judiciouſly he may have applied this rule to the caſe, which was before him, is not the preſent queſtion. The rule itſelf is certainly a well-known one : it depends upon the ſame principles, and is in effect the ſame with Dr. Mills rule of omiſſions ; and " let us hear, ſays [i] Dr. Middleton, " what the Dr. has to alledge *in defence of his rule.* " Why, he ſays, that it is more probable, that a tranſcriber ſhould chuſe rather to clear up an obſcure paſſage, by the inſertion of an explanatory, ſignificant " word, than to darken and confound a clear one, by " omitting or expunging ſuch a word ; and he would defend himſelf by ſhewing, that it is in the perplexed " and dubious paſſages of Scripture, that interpolations " are generally found ; — that tranſcribers think they " do no harm by making the text more intelligible ; " and that this was the common practice of the copyers of St. Jeroms days, who ſays, that they were " uſed to write not what they found, but what they " underſtood : and this is not meer conjecture or ſpeculation, but what all who are converſant in manuſcripts will find confirmed by fact and experiment." The reader will eaſily apply what is here ſaid of omiſſions in particular to various readings in general. Or he may find this rule, which, as far as you can ſee, amounts to the ſame, as if one was to ſay *light is leſs eligible than darkneſs, and ſenſe than nonſenſe,* laid down by Le Clerc. [k] — " Huc pertinet, quod " quæri ſolet, de delectu variarum lectionum, quæ " in

[i] Farther remarks on Bentleys propoſals &c. pag. 16.
[k] Art. critic. P. ii. S. i. c. xvi. parag. 35.

" in MSS paris vetuſtatis et æque emendatis animad-
" vertantur. Sæpe enim variæ lectiones occurrunt,
" quæ omnes cum re ipſa, ſerie orationis, et ſtylo
" ſcriptoris conſentiunt, ex quibus tamen una eligen-
" da eſt. Si omnia ſint paria, non multum quidem
" intereſt quæ eligatur; ſed ſi una ex iis obſcurior ſit,
" cæteræ clariores, tum vero credibile eſt obſcurio-
" rem eſſe veram, cæteras gloſſemata, ut cap. vii. oſ-
" tendimus. Similiter ſi quæ ſit lectio, quæ in uno
" codice occurrat, difficultatemque tollat, quæ inſit
" loco, prout in cæteris omnibus codicibus legitur,
" non illico eſt admittenda. Verendum enim eſt, ne
" emendatio ſit librarii aut critici, qui ex conjectura
" quod non adſequebatur mutaverit, aut quod men-
" dum opinabatur ſuſtulerit.—You may perhaps aſk, whether this rule is *always* to be obſerved in determining what readings are genuine and what ſpurious? But if you do, I ſhall aſk you in return, whether a rule of criticiſm may not be a good one, though it admits of ſome exceptions, and for this reaſon may by haſty critics be applied injudiciouſly?—However, it is rather your buſineſs in this place than mine, to juſtify this rule of criticiſm. For if it is not a good one, we ought here to follow the authority of the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS of the LXX verſion, and to ſay, that Joſhua called the people together not at Shechem but at Shilo: becauſe by reading Shilo inſtead of Shechem the difficulties, which you have raiſed by aſking theſe two queſtions—" Why did Joſhua
" exchange his own city for Shechem, or why aſſemble
" all the tribes at Shechem when the ark of God was at
" Shilo?"—are anſwered at once—He did not exchange his own city for Shechem; but aſſembled all the tribes at Shilo, and went up thither from his own city Timnath-Serah to meet them, becauſe the ark of God was there.—And yet, if you ſhould attempt to juſtify a rule, which you have elſewhere ridiculed ſo much, you will be inconſiſtent with yourſelf.

Beſides the contempt, with which you have treated this rule; there is a farther reaſon, why you ought to

allow, that Shilo is the true reading in this place. — Upon the authority of the Vatican MS only, you [l] determine, that thirty-nine verſes out of eighty-eight have been interpolated in the firſt book of Samuel. How therefore can you refuſe to approve of a reading, which has the authority both of this MS and likewiſe of the Alexandrian MS to ſupport it?

However, though you cannot ſay conſiſtently with yourſelf, that *Shechem* is the true reading; yet if any one elſe was to ſay ſo, I ſhould acquieſce in it; partly becauſe I venture here to differ from Dr. Bentley, and to think, that Mills and Le Clercs rule, which you deſpiſe, is a good one, when it is judiciouſly applied; and partly becauſe I pay leſs regard, than you commonly do, to the authority of the LXX verſion, where it differs from the Hebrew.

Having thus granted what in a diſpute with you I might have denied; let us go on to conſider your two queſtions. According to [m] Joſephus's account, Joſhua was ſettled at Shechem, before he called all the tribes of Iſrael thither: but this hiſtorian mentions no reaſon, why he exchanged Timnath-Serah his own city for Shechem. Other writers ſeem to be of opinion, that he only went to Shechem upon this particular occaſion. [n] Le Clerc in anſwer to *this queſtion* — "Cur Joſua fuit Sechemi hoc tempore?" — ſays, — "ut nimirum oſſa Joſephi monumento inferret, ut docemur v. 32" — [o] Mr. Mede aſks "What place more "fit for Abrahams poſterity to renew a covenant with "their God, than that, where their God firſt made his "covenant with Abraham their father?" But whether Joſhua went to Shechem upon this occaſion only, or had before ſettled there; and whatever might be his reaſon for doing either; we may be ſure that *the convenience of the altar and the law* was not the motive. For firſt, if he had wanted to be near the altar, on which, by Gods own appointment, all the ſolemn ſacrifices preſcribed in the Moſaic law were to be offered; he would

[l] Diſſ. 2. pag. 418. [m] Antiq. L. v. C. i. S. 28.
[n] Comment in Joſ. xxiv. 1. [o] Diſc. xviii. pag. 65.

have removed, not to Shechem, but to Shilo; where the tabernacle and this altar then were. The altar, which he had built on his firſt entrance with the Iſraelites into Canaan, if it remained to the times, that we are ſpeaking of, was no longer an altar for ſtated ſacrifices: theſe were all confined to the altar, which was in Shilo; as the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manaſſeh declare. — [p] "God forbid, ſay they, that we ſhould rebel againſt the Lord, and turn this day from following the Lord to build an altar for burnt-offerings or for meat-offerings, or for ſacrifices, beſides the altar of the Lord our God, that is before his tabernacle." — And ſecondly an altar upon mount Gerizim could not determine Joſhua to go occaſionally to hold an aſſembly at Shechem, which was not upon the mountain, but at the foot of it. Nor thirdly, could any convenience derived from an altar, however ſituated, have any weight with him in chuſing a place for holding an aſſembly, in which no ſacrifices were offered. Indeed when we read in the book of Joſhua — that "he gathered all the tribes of Iſrael, to Shechem; and called for the elders of Iſrael, their heads, their judges, and their officers, and they preſented themſelves before the Lord:" — though there is no mention in this paſſage of either Gerizim or ſacrifices, yet according to your interpretation "he called *the chiefs* of all the tribes to himſelf "upon mount Gerizim, where they preſented themſelves before the Lord, and offered ſacrifice." — If you can allow yourſelf to make ſuch arbitrary ſuppoſitions, as theſe; it will be very eaſy for you to prove any thing, that you have a mind to.

Hitherto we have not ſeen in the hiſtory of this tranſaction any ſufficient reaſon for thinking, that Gerizim was the mount of the law and the altar: nay you have not proved from this hiſtory, in oppoſition to Collins, that the Iſraelites, [whom he calls the Jews] before the ſeparation of the tribes into the kingdoms of Iſrael and Judah, ever worſhipped upon mount Ge-

[p] Joſh. xxii. 29.

Gerizim. I believe indeed, that their preſenting themſelves before the Lord implies, that they worſhipped him; though it does not imply, that they ſacrificed to him: but then this worſhip was performed, not upon mount Gerizim, but at Shechem.

"[q] His aſſertion however, as to *the antient Jews*, "ſeems to you to be confuted by Abraham the great "father and founder of the Jewiſh nation, who re- "ſided at the very town of Sichem, and —— built "his firſt altar at this place, and offered his firſt ſacri- "fice to God."—I ſhall leave it with you to determine with what propriety you conſider *Abraham*—as *a Jew*, and oppoſe what he did to Collins's aſſertion, that "the *Jews* before the ſeparation of Iſrael and Judah "never thought of worſhipping at Gerizim." It is of more importance to the preſent queſtion to enquire, how his building an altar, as you ſay, at the very town of Sichem, as [r] Moſes ſays, at the place of Sichem, that is, at the place, where this town was afterwards built, is a proof of his worſhipping God upon mount Gerizim: becauſe, if you can prove this, you may by the ſame argument prove, that Gerizim was the place, where Joſhua held the aſſembly of the Iſraelites, though in the ſacred hiſtory it is called Shechem. Your argument is this–"The place, which Abra- "ham firſt reſided at in the promiſed land, was by "divine command the very town of Sichem or She- "chem, over which hangs mount Gerizim: ſo that "*Sichem* might well be the general name of both, and "ſometimes comprehend *the town and its mountain*". This diſcovery, that *Sichem might well be a general name ſometimes including both the town and its mountain*, was made after you had written your 40th page: for there, though you ſuppoſe without any evidence, that "Abrahams firſt ſtation was in mount Gerizim," yet you ſpeak with great diffidence about the place of his firſt altar. Your words are — "upon Gerizim, *per*- "*haps*, he built his firſt altar and ſacrificed: but if "not

q Diſſ. 2. pag. 117. r Gen. xii. 6. 7.

" not *upon* the mountain, certainly in Sichem, *at the* " *very foot of it.*"

A man, who looks only into ſuch an edition of the Engliſh bible as has not the marginal verſion, will not ſee even a *perhaps*, that Abrahams firſt altar was built upon mount Gerizim: for the verſion in the text is—"[s] Abraham paſſed through the land into the place of Sichem unto the *plain* of Moreh — and *there* built he an altar unto the Lord." For how can we ſay *perhaps* this altar was upon mount Gerizim; if the ſacred hiſtorian expreſsly ſays, that it was upon the plain? — The marginal verſion reads the *oaken-holt* inſtead of the *plain*, and [t] you have ſome doubt about the preciſe meaning of the words אלן or אלוני מורה. — However, when you tranſlate the word אלן for yourſelf in a [u] paſſage of Exod. xx. which is in the Samaritan pentateuch, but not in the Engliſh Bible, you follow the verſion in the text, and render it *the plain*. From hence one might conjecture, that this is the meaning, which you are moſt inclined to. You beſt know how conſiſtently you tranſlate the words אלן מורא *the plain of Moreh*, and yet ſuppoſe, that the altar, which Abraham built, in אלן מורה or in אלן מורא was upon mount Gerizim. I mention this only as an inſtance of your inconſiſtency, and not as an argument, which in my opinion ought to convince every one elſe, that Abrahams altar was not upon mount Gerizim: becauſe, whatever you might be, I am moſt inclined to think, that אלן ſignifies rather *an oak* or *an oak-grove*, than *a plain*.

But when *might Sichem well be a general name ſometimes including both the town and the mountain?* Certainly not when Abraham built his firſt altar. For he deſcribes it as having been built *at the place of Sichem*, that is, at the place, where this town was afterwards built: and we cannot poſſibly ſuppoſe *Sichem* to have been a general name including the town and the mountain, before the town was in being. Neither

[s] Gen. xii. 6. 7. [t] Diff. pag. 41. [u] Diff. 2. 98.

Neither were they both included in this general name when [x] Jacob built an altar in a parcel of ground, which he bought of Hamor Shechems father. The town was then built: but its name ſeems to have been Shalem: for what we tranſlate—"Jacob came to Shalem *a* city of Shechem"—might perhaps more properly be rendered—"Jacob came to Shalem *the* city of Shechem"—that is, the city, where Shechem the ſon of Hamor dwelt; from whom in all probability this city was afterwards called Shechem. Perhaps you may be ready to ſay, that though in Abrahams time neither the town nor the name of Sichem were in being, yet Moſes, as he uſes this name, when he is writing of theſe times, might uſe it in the ſame general ſenſe, which you ſuppoſe it to have had afterwards. But whoever obſerves, that Moſes deſcribes this altar as having been built *at the place of Sichem* will, I preſume, be ſatisfied, that he uſes the word here to ſignify the town only.

It is very probable, that Abrahams altar was near the place, where Jacob afterwards built his. But the parcel of ground, which he bought, and in which he built his altar, was not in mount Gerizim. This at leaſt is the opinion of the preſent inhabitants of the place, as appears from the following account, which I will tranſcribe from Maundrell. [y] "We ſet forward, ſays he, and proceeding in the narrow valley between Gerizim and Ebal (not above a furlong broad) we ſaw on our right hand juſt without the city [Naploſa] a ſmall moſque ſaid to have been built over the ſepulchre purchaſed by Jacob of Emmor the father of Shechem, Gen. xxxiii. 19." Maundrell diſtinguiſhes this parcel of ground from that, mentioned Gen. xlviii. 22. and Joh. iv. 5, which Jacob gave to his ſon Joſeph; as ſome of the commentators do; though others ſuppoſe them to have been the ſame—"At about one third of an hour from Naploſa we came, ſays he, to Jacobs well, famous

[x] Gen. xxxiii. 18.—20. [y] pag. 62. 63.

" mous, not only upon account of its author, but " much more for the memorable conference, which " our bleſſed Saviour here had with the woman of " Samaria. If it ſhould be queſtioned, whether this be " the very well, that it is pretended for, or no, ſeeing " it may be ſuſpected to ſtand too remote from Sychar, " for women to come ſo far to draw water? it is an- " ſwered, that probably the city extended farther this " way in former times, than it does now; as may be " conjectured from ſome pieces of a very thick wall " ſtill to be ſeen not far from hence.—At this well " the narrow valley of Sychem ends; opening itſelf " into a wide field, which is probably part of that par- " cel of ground, given by Jacob to his ſon Joſeph, " Joh. iv. 5. It is watered with a freſh ſtream riſing " between it and Sychem, which makes it ſo exceed- " ing verdant and fruitful, that it may well be looked " upon as a ſtanding token of the tender affection of " that good patriarch to the beſt of ſons. Gen. xlviii. 22." Whichever of theſe two you would ſuppoſe to have been the place, which Jacob bought of Emmor or Hamor; the altar which he built there, was either in the valley between the two mountains, or in a wide field adjoining to it, and not upon mount Gerizim.–But as you have here by courteſy given mount Gerizim the name of Sichem or Shechem, which name belonged to a city, that was in the valley below it; ſo we ſhall ſee hereafter, that by a like courteſy you aſcribe to the ſame mountain the *beautiful verdure*, which Maundrell obſerved in this wide field near Jacobs well, where the narrow valley between the two mountains ends.

But let us return to the queſtion, about the place, to which Joſhua gathered all the tribes of Iſrael, which in the ſcripture is called Shechem, and which you ſuppoſe to have been Gerizim. " Commentators, you ſay, " have been greatly puzzled at the word במקדש *in* " *ſanctuario*, *in loco ſancto*, here rendered *by the* " *ſanctuary*." The ark was not preſent, and if it had, you can prove, that this was not the ſanctuary here meant; becauſe " the oak could not grow in the ark:"

you

you might have added, that the oak could not grow on an altar; and conſequently no altar on Gerizim could be this ſanctuary. You might have obſerved too, that, when the people had promiſed, ſaying, — " [x] The Lord our God will we ſerve, and his voice will we obey;" — Joſhua took a great ſtone, and ſet it up for a monument of their ſtipulation under an oak, which was in the ſanctuary of the Lord. And Mr. Mede would have taught you " [y] firſt, that if the " ark had been brought from Shilo to Shechem " upon this occaſion, that alone could not have " given denomination to the place, where it ſtood, to " be called the ſanctuary of the Lord: and ſecond- " ly, that if the altar were there with it, the law of " God was not obſerved; which ſaith; — [z] Thou " ſhalt not plant a grove of any trees [or any tree] " near unto the altar of the Lord thy God; neither " ſhalt thou ſet up a pillar, which the Lord thy God " hateth: whereas here are both, an oak or *quercetum* " in the ſanctuary of God, and a pillar or ſtatue " erected under it." From hence you might have inferred, that whatever this ſanctuary of God was, there was no altar of the Lord in it. We may go one ſtep farther. In the book of Judges we read, that [a] " the men of Shechem and the houſe of Millo made Abimelech king by the oak of the pillar, that was in Shechem. And when they told it to Jotham, he went and ſtood on the top of mount Gerizim, and lift up his voice and cried unto them, &c." — Shechem, where the oak and the pillar were, is here ſpoken of as a diſtinct place from the top of Gerizim; and conſequently the whole mountain of Gerizim was not, as you ſuppoſe it to have been, the ſanctuary of the Lord, in which the oak grew and the pillar was ſet up. If then what is here called the ſanctuary of the Lord was neither any particular part of Gerizim, where any altar of God ſtood, nor yet that whole mountain; you cannot infer, that, becauſe there

[x] Joſh. xxiv. 24. 26. [y] Diſc. xviii. pag. 66.
[z] Deut. xvi. 21, 22. [a] Judg. ix. 6. 7.

there was a ſanctuary of the Lord at Shechem, therefore Gerizim was the mountain, on which Joſhua and the Iſraelites built their firſt altar, or that it was ever a ſtated place, where the antient Iſraelites worſhipped God *by ſacrifices*.

Should you enquire what this ſanctuary was; though it is enough for my purpoſe to have ſhewn what it was not, yet for your ſatisfaction I would again refer you to Mr. Mede, who anſwers, "[b]It was a proſeucha "or praying-place, which the Iſraelites, at leaſt thoſe "of Ephraim in whoſe lot it was, after the country "was ſubdued unto them, had erected in that very "place at Sichem, where God firſt appeared to Abram "and where he built his firſt altar, after he was come "into the land of Canaan." This learned writer, whom you may conſult at your leiſure, ſays, "that the *taber-*"*nacle or temple* was *the only place for ſacrifice*; but "that a proſeucha was a plot of ground encompaſſed "with a wall or ſome other like mound or incloſure, "and open above, much like to our courts, the uſe "properly for prayer, as the name proſeucha import-"eth:" and then having ſhewn how well the deſcription and marks of a proſeucha agree to this ſanctuary, he obſerves, that "the Jews had many "other ſuch in other places, as well as at Sichem, "even in thoſe elder times, at Miſpah, for in-"ſtance, and Bethel, and Gilgal, as he makes lit-"tle doubt; which we read to have been places of "aſſembly of the people, and the two laſt ſanctified "of old by divine apparition as Sichem was." And in the margin he adds, "that this ſeems to be the "reaſon, why theſe three places are called by the "LXX, 1 Sam. vii. 16. τοποι ηγιασμενοι, ſanctified "places, though in the original there be no ſuch "thing." Accordingly we find, that as the chiefs of Iſrael preſented themſelves before the Lord at Shechem; ſo [c] Samuel "called the people together unto the Lord in Mizpah, and ſaid, preſent yourſelves before the Lord."

If

[b] Diſc. xviii. pag. 66. [c] 1 Sam. x. 17. 19.

If therefore you only want to prove againſt Collins, that the Iſraelites before their ſeparation into two kingdoms had a ſtated place of worſhip at Shechem; thus far I agree with you. But there are two points, which you have not proved; one is, that Gerizim was ever called Shechem, and conſequently, that to worſhip at Shechem and to worſhip at Gerizim are the ſame thing; the other is, that there was at the time of Joſhua's aſſembling the people at Shechem any altar, where God was to be worſhipped by ſacrifice either at Shechem or on Gerizim.

We have at laſt got through your introduction to that *ſtriking remark* — which you borrowed of Mr. Whiſton. But however *ſtriking* it might appear to you, after you had adopted it, you ſeem to have thought it much leſs ſo, when you read it in his book. For you ſay, [d] that he *has not touched the ſtrongeſt arguments in* ſupport of the Samaritan reading Deut. xxvii. 4: and yet we may obſerve, that he has mentioned this very remark;—*This ſtone hath heard all the words of the Lord.* Joſhua according to your interpretation meant, —— "that this very ſtone had been there, when the law "of God was inſcribed and read to the people, at "their former convention." —— But where do you think this ſtone was, when Joſhua took it up? Was not it at the place, where the people were then aſſembled, that is, at Shechem, which was not upon mount Gerizim, but in the valley below it? And certainly, when Joſhua at their former convention ſtood on one of the mountains and read the law, not only to that half of the people, which ſtood with him, but likewiſe to the other half, which ſtood on the oppoſite mountain; a ſtone, which then laid in the valley, might by the ſame figure of ſpeech be ſaid to have heard all the words of the Lord, as if it had been upon the ſame mountain with Joſhua.

Mr. Whiſton goes on —— "[e] When the woman of "Samaria ſaid to our Saviour from her Samaritan "pentateuch, [f] that their fathers worſhipped in that "moun-

[d] Diſſ. 2. pag. 109. [e] Eſſay, &c. pag. 169. [f] John iv. 20.

" mountain of Gerizim; which probably refers to " this very matter and theſe very texts; our Saviours " anſwer ſeems to allow, from his Jewiſh pentateuch, " that what ſhe ſaid was true." The anſwer [g] to which Mr. Whiſton refers is — " Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jeruſalem worſhip the Father." I cannot charge you in this inſtance with copying from him in that part of your book, where you undertake to defend the Samaritan pentateuch againſt the objections of Collins: for when Collins had ſaid — " Our Sa- " viour may not improbably be ſuppoſed to deter- " mine againſt the Samaritan readings in his conver- " ſation with the woman of Samaria." — You reply, " [h] A very improbable ſuppoſition! for did Chriſt " ſpeak at all of this corruption? did he even hint " at the diſpute between Gerizim and Ebal? — and " this is the only *reading* here under conſideration. " Can then any ſuch determination poſſibly be ex- " torted from words, which do not at all mention, " do not in the leaſt hint at the corruption in queſ- " tion? The enquiry is not relative to the controverſy " between Gerizim and Ebal, but between Gerizim " and Jeruſalem. Chriſt in his reply, certainly names " that mountain *before* Jeruſalem; and ſo far there " is no preference given to the latter — Ye ſhall " worſhip neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jeru- " ſalem. — The truth is, he carefully avoids deter- " mining the queſtion; as what was then, or would " ſoon be, totally unneceſſary." — This, which you ſay in oppoſition to Collins's notion, inſtead of being borrowed from Whiſton, may be applied to confute him. For *if, becauſe Chriſt did not at all mention nor even hint at the corruption in queſtion*, you will infer, that he did not determine againſt the Samaritan read- ing; we may infer on the other hand, that he did not allow it to be the true reading.

But yet in the former part of your work, when you [i] were producing ſuch arguments, as appeared to you to

[g] John iv, 21. [h] Diſſ. 2. pag. 121. [i] Diſſ. 2. pag. 42.

to prove, that the Samaritans have not corrupted their pentateuch, Deut. xxvii. 4. You aſk " does Chriſt " [in this converſation with the Samaritan woman] " charge the Samaritans with having arrogated to " mount Gerizim honours, which did not belong to " it? Does he abuſe the inhabitants of Sichem for " *ſuch a race of wretches* as they have been lately re- " preſented? The Samaritan woman, finding Chriſt " to be a prophet, immediately propoſes the grand " ſubject of diſpute. — *Our fathers worſhipped in this* " *mountain* &c. In anſwer to which, he does not give " the preference, even to Jeruſalem: much leſs does " he ſay, that Ebal had been the mount really ho- " noured by God; and not Gerizim, as her fathers " had falſly pretended." — What diſpute was this, the grand ſubject of which the Samaritan woman propoſed to our Saviour in theſe words — our fathers worſhipped in this mountain &c? was it the diſpute between Gerizim and Ebal? You cannot ſay this without contradicting yourſelf: for we have juſt now found you ſaying — " that the enquiry is not relative " to this controverſy." Was it then the other diſpute about Gerizim and Jeruſalem? If you ſay this, and yet would conclude, that the Samaritans, whatever they might be in other reſpects, had never been ſuch wretches as to corrupt their pentateuch; becauſe Chriſt " does not tell this woman, that Ebal had been " the mount really honoured by God, and not Geri- " zim, as her fathers had falſly pretended;" we may aſk you, whether any ſuch concluſion can be extorted from Chriſts ſaying nothing about a matter, to which, as you tell us in another part of your book, the enquiry, which was then before him, was not relative? Thus whilſt you were ſhewing, that Collins could make no uſe of this converſation between Chriſt and the woman of Samaria towards proving, that the Samaritans, at Deut. xxvii. 4, had corrupted their pentateuch, you have given us an argument, by which we may

may ſhew, that neither Whiſton nor yourſelf can make any uſe of it towards proving the contrary.

If you had not ſeen this otherwiſe, one of your obſervations under this head might have ſerved to ſhew you it. You ſay, "that Chriſt in his anſwer to the womans "enquiry, does not give the preference even to Jeru- "ſalem." But would you, from Chriſts not giving the preference to Jeruſalem, conclude that Jeruſalem was not the appointed place of Gods worſhip? If you would; your concluſion will be contrary to the repeated teſtimony of the prophets and ſacred hiſtorians; *nay* it will likewiſe be contrary to your own declaration, pag. 126, where you ſay, that *Jeruſalem was undoubtedly, at the time of Chriſt, the true place of worſhip*. But if on the other hand you allow, that from Chriſts not giving the preference even to Jeruſalem, it does not follow, that Jeruſalem was not then the true place of worſhip in preference to Gerizim; this might have ſhewn you, that from his not charging the Samaritans with corrupting the pentateuch, in order to repreſent Gerizim as having been the place of Joſhua's altar in preference to Ebal, you cannot conclude, that they were not the authors of this corruption: his ſilence in this caſe proves no more, than it proves in the other.

After having allowed *Jeruſalem to be undoubtedly the true place of worſhip in our Saviours time*; how will you excuſe your favourite Samaritans for worſhipping in a ſchiſmatical temple at Gerizim? [k] "They can, "you ſay, no otherwiſe be excuſed than by your re- "collecting—that upon the rebuilding the Jeruſalem- "temple, the Samaritans readily offered to aſſiſt in "rebuilding it, which implied their readineſs and re- "ſolution jointly to worſhip in it -- that they profeſ- "ſed to worſhip *the ſame* God, and were therefore de- "ſirous to worſhip him in *the ſame place* --- but that "theſe peaceable and dutiful intentions were unkind- "ly obſtructed, and their propoſal for avoiding ſchiſm "was roughly rejected by the Jews." --- The accuracy

[k] Diſſ. 2. pag. 126.

racy of this defence, is worth enquiring into. What you here call a ready offer, you have [l] elſewhere called a kind, and religious propoſal, and to prove that it was ſo, have referred to Ezra iv. 1. &c. In the firſt and ſecond verſes of this chapter Ezra informs us, that "when *the adverſaries of Judah and Benjamin* heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto the Lord God of Iſrael; then they came to Zerubbabel and to the chief of the fathers, and ſaid unto them, Let us build with you; for *we ſeek your God, as ye do*, and we do ſacrifice unto him, *ſince the days of Eſarhaddon king of Aſſur*, which brought us up hither." Have you any reaſon to be offended, if I call it an innaccuracy to repreſent thoſe men, as coming to the children of the captivity with *a kind and peaceable intention*, whom Ezra, when he ſpeaks of their coming, expreſsly calls *the adverſaries of Judah and Benjamin?* --- Some of your readers may poſſibly be diſpoſed to call it by a harſher name.—An accurate man might have collected from the ſecond verſe, that the propoſal made by the Samaritans was not a dutiful and religious one, at leaſt that it was ſuch an one, as the worſhippers of the true God could not agree to. "You ſay, that they profeſſed themſelves "to be worſhippers of the ſame God, whom the Iſ-"raelites worſhipped, and were therefore deſirous of "worſhipping him in the ſame place." --- They did indeed profeſs this; but they profeſſed at the ſame time, that their fathers likewiſe worſhipped him from the days of Eſarhaddon; which makes it reaſonable to believe, that they worſhipped him in the ſame manner, as their fathers had done: and the ſacred hiſtorian, who wrote the ſecond book of [m] Kings, informs us in what manner their fathers worſhipped him, --- "They feared the Lord and ſerved their own gods." And we have the teſtimony of the ſame hiſtorian, that the like idolatrous worſhip was practiſed by them at the time, when he wrote; for he adds --- "Unto this

[l] pag. 60. [m] xvii. 33, 34—41.

this day they do after the former manners: they fear not the Lord [that is, they fear him not as they ought to do] neither do they after their ſtatutes, or after their ordinances or after the law and commandment, which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, whom he named Iſrael; with whom the Lord had made a covenant, and charged them, ſaying, ye ſhall not fear other gods, nor bow yourſelves to them, nor ſerve them, nor ſacrifice to them; but the Lord, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt with great power and a ſtretched-out-arm, him ſhall ye fear, and him ſhall ye worſhip, and to him ſhall ye do ſacrifice. And the ſtatutes and the ordinances, and the law and the commandment, which he wrote for you, ye ſhall not forget, neither ſhall ye fear other gods. But the Lord your God ye ſhall fear, and he ſhall deliver you out of the hand of all your enemies. Howbeit, they did not hearken, but they did after their former manners. So theſe nations feared the Lord, and ſerved their graven images both their children and their childrens children as did their fathers, ſo do they unto this day." The moſt common opinion, as you may find in [n] Du Pin and Patrick, is, that Ezra wrote this book, or rather compiled it from the public records, and made ſome additions of his own to the materials, which he extracted from thence. If this account is true, the paſſage, which I have juſt now quoted, where the Samaritans are ſaid to ſerve their graven images *even to this day*, is as likely as any to have been one of Ezra's additions. And this brings their idolatry down ſomething later than the time, when they were rejected by Zerubbabel and Jeſhua. But whether Ezra was the compiler of this book, or not; we are ſure, that ſome parts of it muſt have been written as late as the 37th year of the captivity of Jehoiachin king

[n] Du Pins Hiſtory of Canon, &c. pag. 85. Patricks preface to comment on Kings, pag. 1.

king of Judah, that is, about 25 years before the return of the Jews from Babylon; as you may ſee in Prideaux's chronological tables: for the [k] hiſtorian ſpeaks of what happened to Jehoiachin in the end of this year, in the twelfth month, in the ſeven and twentieth day of the month. But if his teſtimony, that the Samaritans *ſerve their graven images even to this day*, will bring down their idolatry ſo near to the times, of which we are ſpeaking; this, when it is joined to the account, which they gave of themſelves and their anceſtors to Zerubbabel and to the chief of the fathers, leaves no one, who is not under the byaſs of a favourite hypotheſis, any reaſon to doubt of their being idolaters, when they made what you call *a dutiful and religious* propoſal to the Jews.

[l] Reland in his diſſertation concerning the Samaritans taught me this argument to prove, that they were probably idolaters, when they applyed to Zerubbabel and Jeſhua for leave to join with them in building the temple of God. You ſometimes refer your readers to this diſſertation. With what degree of attention you read it yourſelf; they may now judge.

What followed, upon the Samaritans being refuſed leave to join with the Jews in building the temple, may likewiſe help to ſhew us, whether their propoſal was *a dutiful and religious one*, or not. Did they immediately go and erect a temple for themſelves on mount Gerizim? [m] You indeed ſpeak of them as "*determining* to erect a temple amongſt themſelves, after being "*forbid* to join in rebuilding the temple at Jeruſalem," without taking the leaſt notice, that any interval of time paſſed between theſe two facts. But from the time of their being rejected by the Jews, about the third of Cyrus and 534th year before Chriſt, to the time of their building a temple on Gerizim about the 16th of Darius Nothus and 408th before Chriſt, there is an interval of 126 years. For ſo long

a

[k] 2 Kings xxv. 27. [l] Diſſert. Miſcell. Par. alter. pag. 5. 6.
[m] Diſſ. 2. pag. 35.

a time this *dutiful and religious people* were contented to be without a temple.

To prove, that the Samaritans *civilly* offered to unite with the Jews, and that their propoſal was a *kind and religious* one, you refer, as I have juſt now [n] obſerved, to Ezra iv. 1, &c. How far you deſigned this *&c* ſhould lead your readers, when they conſult the book of Ezra, I do not know: but if they read to verſes 4, 5, they will find, how theſe *kind and civil and religious* Samaritans with their *peaceable and dutiful intentions* were employed, as ſoon as their propoſal was rejected. Inſtead of going quietly home and building a temple for themſelves, they made uſe of all the means in their power to hinder their neighbours from building one; "they weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building; and hired counſellors againſt them to fruſtrate their purpoſe, all the days of Cyrus king of Perſia, even until the reign of Darius king of Perſia."

What you have thought proper to call a *rough* rejection of theſe men, and an *unkind* obſtruction of their intentions in propoſing to unite with the Jews, came from Zerubbabel and the chief of the fathers, of whom Jeſhua was one. [o] Philalethes has already given you a hint, that it would have been full as pious and religious not to have cenſured the act of ſuch men as theſe. But beſides the weight of Zerubbabels and Jeſhuas character, you ſhould have conſidered; firſt, that Ezra in the ivth chapter, to which you refer your readers, ſpeaks of what they had done in ſuch a manner, as ſhews him to have approved of it; [p] ſecondly, that when the Samaritans continued their oppoſition to the Jews, the prophets Haggai and Zachariah, inſtead of blaming their countrymen for rejecting the propoſal, which had been made to them, and commanding them to ſuffer thoſe, who had made it, to unite with them in rebuilding the houſe of God, exhorted them to go on with the work, which that op-

[n] Pag. 47.
[o] Library N°. iv. pag. 207.
[p] Ezra v. 1. 2.

oppoſition had interrupted; [q] thirdly, that when Zerubbabel and Jeſhua in conſequence of this exhortation "began again to build the houſe of God, which is in Jeruſalem," though they did not recall their former act, and were ſtill oppoſed by the Samaritans, "the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews, and their enemies could not cauſe them to ceaſe, till the matter came to Darius," who commanded theſe oppoſers to "let the work of this houſe of God alone, and to let the governour of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this houſe of God in his place;" and laſtly, that [r] Zerubbabel, who in your judgment had laid the foundation of this houſe in a rough and unkind rejection of a kind and peaceable, a dutiful and religious propoſal, had in the judgment of God laid it in ſuch a manner, as to receive a promiſe from him, *that his hands ſhould finiſh it.*

[s] You obſerve farther, "that the Samaritan woman "expreſſed her expectation of the Meſſias — that "Chriſt made a clear declaration to her of his being "ſo — that ſhe believed him to be ſo — that ſhe went "haſtily into Sichem, full of the intereſting diſco-"very — that at the importunate requeſt of the in-"habitants, Chriſt continued in the town at the foot "of Gerizim for two days — and that many of thoſe "Samaritans were ſuch candid judges, ſo ingenuouſly "diſpoſed to embrace the truth, that they ſaid; "*Now we believe — we have heard him ourſelves, and "we know, that this is indeed* the Chriſt *the Saviour "of the world.*" You then explain the purpoſe, which you had in view in giving your readers this account of her and her townſmen by producing firſt Lightfoots remark, in which he extolls this confeſſion of the Samaritans, as an inſtance of faith higher by ſome degrees than the Jews common creed concerning the Meſſias, and ſecondly a comment of St. Chryſoſtom on the behaviour of this woman and her

[q] Ezra v. 2. 3. 4. 5. vi. 6. 7. [r] Zechar. iv. 8. 9.
[s] Diſſ. 2. pag. 43.

her friends, in which he prefers it to the behaviour of the Jews. Baſnage in his hiſtory of the Jews, B. ii. c. iv. S. 19. will inform you, that the fathers "make an oppoſition between the inhabitants of "Sichem and the apoſtles, very honourable to the "former; for a woman preached to them all: Mary "Magdalene related our Saviours reſurrection to his "diſciples, who did not believe her; whereas the "Samaritans upon the word of a looſe woman went "out of the city to hear a prophet, of whom ſhe had "ſpoken to them, and believed on him." If you do not think, that this remark will prove the Samaritans to have been leſs likely to have corrupted the ſcriptures even than the apoſtles; why ſhould you think that St. Chryſoſtoms comment will prove them to have been leſs likely to have done this than the Jews? The truth is, that from what Chriſt elſewhere ſays —"[t] They, that are whole, need not a phyſician, but they, that are ſick"—and from the occaſion of his ſaying this, which was, that the ſcribes and phariſees blamed him for eating and drinking with publicans and ſinners; you might have learned, that his converſing with this woman was no evidence of her good diſpoſition. Whatever other good quality ſhe might have before her converſion, you cannot boaſt of her chaſtity — "[u] Thou haſt had five huſbands, ſays our Saviour; and he, whom thou now haſt, is not thy huſband."— And we find, that ſhe, like the reſt of the Samaritans, claimed to be deſcended from the ſtock of Iſrael, which, if ſhe knew any thing of the hiſtory of her anceſtors, would give us no very high opinion of her veracity. It certainly muſt make us think, that ſuch of her countrymen, as inculcated this notion, and yet had opportunities of being better informed, were in this inſtance at leaſt not very ſincerely deſirous of ſearching out and *embracing the truth:* for if they had, they would have found, and would have owned, themſelves to be the poſterity of the Cuthæans, &c, and of ſuch renegado Jews as had no longer

[t] Mark ii. 16.17. [u] John iv. 18.

longer any right to conſider themſelves as Iſraelites. Our Saviour indeed, when ſhe ſaid, —— "*Our fathers* worſhipped in this mountain," —— did not endeavour to correct her error, and to inform her, that ſhe and her countrymen were aliens from them, whom ſhe called *their fathers:* but upon other occaſions he carefully diſtinguiſhed between the Samaritans and the Iſraelites: for when he ſent forth his apoſtles, his charge to them was — "[x] Go not into the way of the gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael." Nay the readineſs of ſome of the inhabitants of Sichem or Sychar to embrace the goſpel, when Chriſt propoſed it to them, inſtead of proving, that all the inhabitants in general, will not prove, that even theſe in particular, had hitherto been of a good diſpoſition: unleſs you think, that we may infer the publicans and harlots to have been people of a good character and of virtuous deportment, becauſe they were more [y] ready to embrace it, than the chief prieſts and elders.

[z] But to vindicate the general credit of the antient Samaritans, you farther alledge that well-known parable, in which Chriſt introduces a Samaritan taking pity on a naked and wounded traveller, after he had been neglected by a prieſt and a levite. To this you add, what appears to you a ſtronger authority in their favour, that out of ten lepers, who had applied to Chriſt to be healed, though all of them, as they were by his order going to ſhew themſelves to the prieſt, found, that they were cleanſed; yet he took notice, that only one, and he a ſtranger, had piety and gratitude enough to return to give glory to God: and the evangeliſt informs us, that this ſtranger was a Samaritan. From our Saviours drawing the character of a beneficent and charitable man in the perſon of a Samaritan; and from the notice, which he takes of the

[x] Matt. x. 5. 6. [y] Matt. xxi. 31. [z] Diſſ. 2, pag. 44. Luc. x. 30.—35. xvii. 11.—19.

the pious and thankful behaviour of the Samaritan leper, you would infer, that the people of this country were in general of a good diſpoſition. [a] Philalethes queſtions, "not only whether this parable "and hiſtory will prove, that the antient Samaritans, "who lived in the times, when the pentateuch was "corrupted, were men of a good diſpoſition, but "likewiſe whether they can be good evidence of the "ſuperior virtue of the Samaritan nation in general, "even in Chriſts age." We may go one ſtep farther — They are ſo far from being good evidence of this, that they prove the direct contrary. You allow, "that "the nine Jewiſh lepers were deſigned to be branded "with everlaſting infamy in the ſacred page for the "moſt aſtoniſhing unthankfulneſs:" and without doubt Chriſt deſigned by the parable of the charitable Samaritan to reproach the Jews of the age, in which he lived, for their inhumanity. But whether do you think, that the infamy would be greater and the reproach ſeverer, if the inſtances of the oppoſite virtues were found in a nation, where the people in general were of a good, or where they were of a bad, diſpoſition? Certainly, where they were of a bad one. The proper inference therefore from theſe two inſtances is, that the Samaritans in our Saviours time were in general bad men.

[b] We may obſerve, that Collins has been beforehand with you in attempting to prove the general good diſpoſition of the Samaritans from the hiſtory of the Samaritan woman and her townſmen, and from the parable of the traveller who fell among thieves. "Our "bleſſed Saviour, he ſays, ſeems to ſuppoſe the "Samaritans in a better way to heaven than even the "Jewiſh Levites: and it ſeems, that [when he ſaid "ſalvation is of the Jews] he ſhould not condemn "the Samaritan woman, with whom he converſed, "and other Samaritans, whom ſhe brought to him; "who all believed him to be the Meſſias, and that "with more readineſs than the Jeruſalem Jews." And

[a] Library, &c. N°. iv. pag. 205. [b] Grounds and reaſons, &c. pag. 172.

And it may perhaps be matter of ſurprize to ſome of your readers, that you, " who adviſe Chriſtians to be " extreamly cautious how they join with Mr. Collins " in his opinion about the Samaritan pentateuch," ſhould yet join with him in his opinion about the general good character of the Samaritans, and even borrow his arguments to eſtabliſh it, when the queſtion is, whether the Jews or they were more likely to corrupt the ſcriptures.

But ſuppoſe, you had proved, what you have not, that the Samaritans in general were in our Saviours time men *of a worthy diſpoſition*; we might apply to this caſe what you ſay in another; " [c] Were the " queſtion here concerning a corruption introduced" *in the time of Chriſt*, the character of the Samaritans, who lived then; " might perhaps have been properly " urged. But as the queſtion is concerning a cor- " ruption introduced about 400 *years before Chriſt*; " I cannot ſee, how" their character " can be of " any uſe." [d] Philalethes has mentioned this objection: and you were aware of it; for after telling us, that you " acknowledge *their* good character not to " be concluſive in favour of *their anceſtors*, you add, " that no greater ſtreſs is laid upon the particulars of " this article, than to eſtabliſh *the general character* of " the Samaritans; in oppoſition to thoſe writers, who " revile that people, of all ages, as a race of wretches " the moſt profligate and moſt abandoned." I am not at all concerned to juſtify what other writers may have ſaid: all I wanted to ſhew about the character of this people was, that they were idolaters, when the Jews returned from the captivity, and that you have not proved them to be in general men of *a worthy diſpoſition* in the time of Chriſt. This latter point, though you have not proved it, I have allowed you to make the moſt of, as if you had proved it. And by your own confeſſion the moſt you can make of it is no-

[c] Diff. 2. pag. 28. Diff. 2. pag. 47.

[d] Library, &c. N°. iv. pag. 204.

nothing to the purpoſe of the preſent queſtion. But yet in the very next paragraph you ſay — " If then, " from this worthy diſpoſition of the Samaritans and " from their profound veneration for the law of " Moſes, they ſhould be thought *leſs likely* to have " made the wilful corruption, which is conſidered in " the preſent chapter, &c." — How far you have ſhewn them to have a profound veneration for the law of Moſes, will be ſeen immediately: at preſent I need only acquaint the reader, that you produce no evidence of it more antient than the year 440 after Chriſt; and conſequently that this veneration is as little to the purpoſe in the queſtion now before us, as the good character of the Samaritans in our Saviours time. But give me leave to aſk you, whether you imagined, that your readers from *the worthy diſpoſition* of the Samaritans, as far as you can ſuppoſe yourſelf to have made it out, would think them *leſs likely* to have been the authors of the wilful corruption, about which you were enquiring; when you had but juſt informed them, that you did not think ſo yourſelf, by acknowledging, that the good character of thoſe Samaritans, who lived in our Saviours time, is not concluſive in favour of their anceſtors. Perhaps when you ſaid this, you meant, that this argument is not *ſtrictly demonſtrative*, but had a reſerve, that it would induce a probability: if this is the caſe, you acknowledged but half the truth; for the good diſpoſition of the Samaritans in the age of Chriſt is not only *no concluſive evidence* in the ſtrict ſenſe of the words, but is *no evidence at all*, that their anceſtors 400 years before were of the ſame diſpoſition. But beſides allowing this evidence not to be *concluſive*, you profeſs to lay no greater ſtreſs upon the particulars, which you had been alledging, than to eſtabliſh *the general character* of the Samaritans; in oppoſition to thoſe writers, who revile *that people* of all ages, as a profligate and abandoned race of men. Could any one, after you had made this profeſſion, have expected, that in the next breath you would lay greater ſtreſs upon them, than to prove

the

the Samaritans not to have been a profligate race of wretches in our Saviours age, and in ſome other ages, which have followed this; and that you would conſider them as evidence, which might induce your readers to think, that the anceſtors of theſe Samaritans were *leſs likely* to have been the corrupters of the pentateuch 400 years before Chriſt, in the age of Nehemiah?

When you next endeavour to find out, who were probably the corrupters of Deut. xxvii. 4, by comparing the character of the Jews with that of the Samaritans; inſtead of enquiring what their reſpective characters were ſo late as the times of Chriſt, or 440 years after his time; it would be more to your purpoſe to conſider, whether the character of Nehemiah and of the Jews, who adhered to him, when compared with that of Sanballat, and of his ſon-in-law Manaſſeh an apoſtate prieſt, and of the other renegado Jews, who like him were driven away by Nehemiah for tranſgreſſing the law of Moſes, will induce one to think, that the former or that the latter were the authors of this corruption.

But it is time to perform my promiſe, and to enquire what ſort of evidence you produce to ſhew the great veneration of the Samaritans for the law of Moſes. "[f] Sozomen, who, as you inform us, flou-
" riſhed about the year 440 [after Chriſt] and was
" educated in their neighbourhood," is one of the witneſſes, whom you call to their character: and he ſays of them, [g] τȣ Μωσεως νομȣ τα μαλιϛα ζηλωȣαι τυȣχανȣϛι. —So that, becauſe Sozomen calls the Samaritans of his time zealous obſervers of the law of Moſes, you would conclude, that their anceſtors, who lived 840 years before, [h] when the wilful corruption was introduced into Deut. xxvii. 4, had a profound veneration for it.

Another of your witneſſes is Dr. Huntington, who,
" when he was in the eaſt, viſited the Samaritans at
" Sichem, and in his letter to Ludolfus acquaints us,
" you ſay, that *one of theſe Samaritans had a MS copy*

[f] Diſſ. 2. pag. 41. [g] L. vii. c. 18. [h] Diſſ. pag. 28. 29.

" *copy of the law hung round his neck, affectionately car-*
" *rying it in his boſom.*" When I read theſe laſt words, which are printed in your diſſertation, as they are here, in a different character from the reſt, I took it for granted, and from this manner of printing one would think you deſigned all your readers ſhould take it for granted, that they are the very words of Huntington tranſlated into Engliſh. But upon reading over his letter I found myſelf miſtaken. The Samaritans in a letter to Ludolfus had ſaid, "[i] Scimus quod in An-
" glia ſint ex noſtratibus aliqui: allatæ enim nobis
" fuerunt ab illis literæ."—One of his notes on this letter is; —— " Dictum mihi fuit Anglum quendam,
" ut obtineret ab eis [Samaritanis] MS pentateu-
" chum, oſtenſis literis Samaritanis, perſuaſiſſe illis, da-
" ri etiam Samaritas in Anglia, ad linguæ peritos allu-
" dentem."—And in a letter, which they ſent to their ſuppoſed brethren in England, they write,—" Certos
" autem vos facimus, o cœtus fratrum noſtrorum
" filiorum Iſrael, veniſſe ad nos virum præputiatum
" Europæum veſtratem nomine Robertum Hunting-
" tonum, qui annunciavit nobis eſſe vos populum
" bene magnum — aiebat inſuper vos illum ad nos
" Sichemum miſiſſe expetitum a nobis legis exemplar.
" — niſi autem eſſet ex amore noſtro erga vos, haud
" miſiſſemus legem per virum præputiatum, hoc
" enim opprobrium nobis eſſet. Nos autem petitioni
" veſtræ obtemperantes miſimus ad vos librum legis,
" &c."—Huntington afterwards, in a letter to Ludolfus, denied his having endeavoured to perſuade the Samaritans, that any of their brethren were ſettled in England: and after informing him, how they came to take up ſuch an opinion, he goes on thus — "[k] Non
" recte igitur dicitur, quaſi illis [Samaritanis] per-
" ſuaſiſſem, fratres ſuos in Anglia degiſſe; expreſſe
" enim aiebam e contrario; ſed credere nollent, quia
" præ omnibus maluiſſent; neque conjectarentur,
" unde literas Samariticas addiſcerem. Inſuper ne-
que

[i] Epiſt. Samarit. Sichemitarum, &c. pag. 5. 25. 29.
[k] Huntingtoni epiſt. pag. 50.

" que aiebam eſſe multos ipſorum apud nos, eoſque
" me miſiſſe expetitum legis exemplar. Verum ut
" melius intelligerent, qui qualeſve fuerunt Hebræi,
" de quibus verba facerem, expediret, dixi, ut hiſto-
" riam religionis ſuæ ſatis amplam contexerent, ſpe-
" ciatim in quantum ab Judæis diſcrepant, etiam et
" legis ſacroſanctæ codicem mitterent, quem literis
" minuſculis et magnam partem evanidis ſcriptum
" ſtatim mihi porrigunt, e ſinu alicujus ipſorum de-
" tractum, ita enim collo ſuſpenſum geſtavit."——
The reader may ſee, that Huntington relates the fact, but that in the mean time he ſays not a word about this Samaritans deſign of expreſſing his affection for the pentateuch by carrying it in this manner. One might as well ſuppoſe you to declare the affection of a bookſellers boy for the bible; if you were accidentally led to ſay, that you had bought one of his maſter, and that, when he brought it to your chambers, it was tucked into his boſom. It might at firſt ſight have appeared more to your purpoſe to have told us, that the Samaritans in their letter to their ſuppoſed brethren in England profeſs ſuch a reverence for the pentateuch, that nothing but their love for theſe brethren ſhould have prevailed with them to truſt a copy of it with an uncircumciſed perſon. But upon a cloſer examination their reverence for it would be found not to have been ſo great as they pretended; if what Huntington ſays be true, that they readily truſted him with this copy upon a groundleſs opinion, that there were Samaritans in England; into which opinion they had led themſelves by miſunderſtanding what he had ſaid, and by finding, that he was able to read the Samaritan characters; notwithſtanding he endeavoured to ſet them right.

But what if not only this, but every other Samaritan, whom Huntington ſaw, had had a pentateuch hanging about his neck as a mark of his affection for it? this would have been no better evidence, that they would not corrupt it, than the [1] broad phylacteries of the

[1] Matth. xxiii. 5. Mar. vii. 13.

the ſcribes and phariſees were, that they would not make the word of God void by their traditions.

In the laſt place I would aſk you, What you think was the reading of this MS, Deut. xxvii. 4? — Unleſs the MS, which in your diſſertation you have thus deſcribed — [m] N°. 5. Oxford [Marſh] Bodl. 12°. N°. 15—is obliterated in this place; you may eaſily anſwer this queſtion: for if I conjecture rightly, this is the very book, which hung round the Samaritans neck. From Dr. Huntingtons letter to Ludolfus, and from the letter of the Samaritans to their brethren in England, as quoted above, it appears, that the Dr. had this pentateuch. And Smith in his life [n] of Huntington ſays, that he himſelf ſent Huntingtons Samaritan pentateuch to the Archbiſhop of Armagh, who at the time, when he ſaid this, was Narciſſus Marſh. But if I am miſtaken; you will, I make no doubt, as readily ſuppoſe, that this pentateuch read Gerizim in this place as you do, [o] that the Greek verſion made from the Samaritan text, if there ever was ſuch a verſion, had this reading. Allowing therefore, what does not appear, that this Samaritan deſigned to expreſs his own affection and the affection of his countrymen for the pentateuch by hanging the copy, which he brought to their conference with Huntington, round his neck, and ſo carrying it in his boſom; yet can you imagine, that their fondneſs in the latter end of the laſt century for a pentateuch, which commanded the Iſraelites to build their firſt altar in Gerizim, is any evidence, that their anceſtors, above 2000 years before, would not have corrupted a pentateuch, which commanded this altar to be built on Ebal?

The mention of Dr. Huntington will take me off a little while from our preſent enquiry: for as I have juſt now ſhewn my readers in what manner you have repreſented his account of the Samaritan, who had a pentateuch hanging about his neck, and in what manner you reaſon from it; I chuſe to let them ſee at once

[m] Diſſ. 2. pag. 539.
[n] pag. xv. xxvi. xxxiii.
[o] Diſſ. 2. pag. 31. 32.

once with what degree of attention you have read his letters and the hiſtory of his life: and this perhaps may lead me to ſpeak of ſome other matters, which, though they are not connected with the corruption of Deut. xxvii. 4, are however not foreign to my general deſign. Whilſt Dr. Huntington was in the eaſt, he ſaw in the hands of theſe Samaritans an old MS of the pentateuch, which they pretend to have been written, not, as you ſay in your firſt diſſertation, pag. 311. by *Phineas the ſon of Eleazar the ſon of Aaron* but by [p] *Abiſha the ſon of Phineas*, &c. — "[q] This celebrated copy, you tell us, was thought to be "about 500 years old, when examined (in 1690) by "Dr. Huntington, and refer us to his 33d and 35th "epiſtles." But from Smiths hiſtory of his life, prefixed to his epiſtles, you might have learned, that 1690 could not be the year, in which he examined this copy: [q] for he was returned from the eaſt, and took the degree of Dr. in divinity at Oxford in the year 1683. I can find nothing in either epiſtle, which ſhould lead you to ſuppoſe, that 1690 was the year, in which he examined it, but much in one of them to ſhew the contrary: for in 1690, when he wrote epiſt. 33d, he was retreated to England, in order to avoid the inconveniences, which he might otherwiſe have ſuffered from the war then carrying on in Ireland; where, as we learn from Dr. Smith, he had been made provoſt of Trinity college in Dublin in the end of the year 1683, or the beginning of the year following. And as in the poſtſcript of this letter, which is written to Ludolfus, he ſends him the compliments of Dr. Hyde and Dr. Bernard; it is moſt likely, that he was then at Oxford. Perhaps you thought 1690 to be the year, when he examined this MS; becauſe 1690 is the date of this letter: but then you might as well have ſuppoſed, that he examined it in 1695; for this is the date of the other. This miſtake is not in-

[p] Hunting. epiſt. xxxv. Epiſt Samarit. pag. 4. 13. 29.
[q] Diſſ. 2. pag. 540. 541. Smith de vit. et ſtudiis Huntingtoni, pag. xxiv. xxv.

indeed a very material one: but when you were ſpeaking about the probable date of a Samaritan MS, it might have been as well, if you had given us a better ſpecimen of your accuracy.

You ſay, [r] that "Maundrell ſaw this famous MS "in the year 1697." What he ſays is—"[s] The prieſt "ſhewed me a copy of the Samaritan pentateuch, but "would not be perſuaded to part with it upon any "conſideration. He had likewiſe the firſt volume of "the Engliſh polyglott, which he ſeemed to eſteem "equally with his own MS."—Maundrell ſays not a word about its being the famous MS, but rather intimates, that it was not, by calling it the prieſts own. Perhaps you concluded, that the pentateuch, which he ſaw, was this; becauſe you did not know of their having any other. But Huntington would have informed you, that he ſaw two laid up in their ſynagogue. His words are — "[t] Cum legiſſem hanc epiſtolam de libro "legis ab Abiſha conſcripto, cupiebam quam ma-"xime monumentum hoc ſummæ antiquitatis conſpi-"cere, et poſt quinque annos Neapolim rurſus adeo, "et cum præcipuis Samaritis venerandum hunc co-"dicem in Synagoga eorum latitantem inſpicio: e "binis inibi conſervatis audacter denuo pronunciant, "quod eſſet ipſiſſimus liber."—From this account, if you had attended to it, you might have obſerved, that, a few years before Maundrell was at Naploſe, the Samaritans there had at leaſt one MS, beſides their famous one, and that, as theſe were both kept in their ſynagogue, and therefore ſeem to have belonged to the public, it is very improbable, that what Maundrell ſaw, and calls the prieſts own MS, ſhould have been either of theſe two.

There is a farther reaſon for thinking, that you had overlooked, or forgotten, what Huntington ſays, that he ſaw two MSS of the pentateuch, which were kept in the ſynagogue of the Samaritans at Naploſe. For [u] in your catalogue of Samaritan MSS you mention only

[r] Diſſ. 2. pag. 577. [s] pag. 62. [t] Epiſt. xxxv. pag. 56.
[u] Diſſert. 2. pag. 540. 541.

only the famous one, and take no notice of the other. [y] You quote what Le Long ſays, when he is ſpeaking of that, which is in your own catalogue, — "hunc "etiamnum conſervant moderni Samaritani quem "ſummopere venerantur;" — and likewiſe what Mr. John Uſgate ſays, "in a letter to Mr. Swinton dated "from Acre and received at Oxford in Auguſt 1734, "— that they had ſtill their old MS of the penta-"teuch, and that he had made propoſals and hoped "ſoon to agree with them for the purchaſe of it." I allow, that Le Longs and Uſgates evidence of the exiſtence of this MS is ſufficient to authorize you to put it into your catalogue. But if, becauſe Le Long and Uſgate ſay, that the Samaritans have this MS, you concluded, that they have no other; your concluſion was made too haſtily.

You have certainly inſerted at leaſt one Hebrew MS into your catalogue, of the exiſtence of which you have not ſo good evidence, as you might have had from Huntington of the exiſtence of a ſecond Samaritan MS at Naploſe; I ſhould rather have ſaid, that you have inſerted one, for the exiſtence of which you have no evidence at all, that can be found from your references. The MS, which I mean, you call [z] *a Bible:* and the place where it is to be found is *Pekin*—Library called *Fan-King-Tchang*. In proof of its exiſtence you refer your readers to *Purchas's Relations*, vol. 5. pag. 150. I do not know what book this is. — *Purchas* about the year 1613, publiſhed a ſingle volume, which he called—*Pilgrimage or Relations of the world and the religions*, &c. In the year 1625 he publiſhed four volumes, under the title of *Pilgrimes*, which are a collection of voyages and travels. In the title-page of theſe four volumes there is nothing, which could lead you to call them *Purchas's relations*. And from comparing together two dedications prefixed to the fourth edition of his *Pilgrimage or relations*, which was printed in the year 1626, it appears, that he did not conſider this work as

[y] Diſſ. 2. pag. 541. [z] Diſſ. 2. pag. 530.

as a part or fifth volume of his *Pilgrimes*. If I ſhould ſuppoſe, that this ſingle volume of his *Pilgrimage or relations* is the book, which you mean, becauſe at page 150, which is the page you refer to, there is mention of a Hebrew MS; upon this ſuppoſition you muſt be guilty of another inaccuracy. The account of this MS is inſerted by him from Ricci and Trigautius, and is as follows. — "It is but few "years ſince the Jeſuites could ſettle themſelves "at Paquin, the royal citie of China. Thither did a "certain Jew—reſort unto them. This Jew was borne "at *Chaifamfu* the mother citie of the province of "Honan, his name was Ngai. — Seeing the Hebrew "bible, he knew the letters, but could not read them. "He told them, that in *Caifamfu* were ten or twelve "families of Iſraelites, and a faire ſynagogue, which "had lately coſt them ten thouſand crowns; therein "the pentateuch in rolles, which had beene with great "veneration preſerved five or ſix hundred yeeres. In "Hamcheu, the chief citie of Chequian, he affirmed, "were many families with their ſynagogue: many alſo "in other places, but without ſynagogues and by de-"grees wearing out.—His brother, he ſaid, was ſkil-"full in the Hebrew, which he in affection to the "China preferment had neglected; and therefore was "highly cenſured by the ruler of the ſynagogue. To "this citie did Ricci ſend one of his to enquire; who "found theſe reports true, which alſo copied the be-"ginnings and endings of their bookes, which they "compared and found to agree with their own pen-"tateuch, ſaving that they wanted pricks or points. "He writ alſo in China characters to the ruler of the "ſynagogue, that he had the reſt of the bookes of "the old teſtament, and other bookes of the new, "which contained the acts of the Meſſias being al-"ready come." — Here is mention made indeed of a bible at Paquin or Pekin; but it is the bible of the Jeſuits (a printed one I preſume) conſiſting of the old and new teſtament. A MS is likewiſe mentioned, but it is a MS of the pentateuch only; and this pentateuch was

not

not in any library at *Pekin*, but at *Chaifamfu* the capital of the province of Honan.

In your catalogue of Hebrew MSS, at page 524 of your ſecond diſſertation, you inſert one, at Cai-Fong-Fu, China, and deſcribe it to be *a pentateuch very antient*, and 12 *copies taken from it*. Le Longs Biblioth. cap. 2. is one of the books, to which you refer us in proof of the exiſtence of this pentateuch. Now from Le Long it appears, that this MS, at Cai-Fong-Fu is the ſame book with that, which is mentioned by Purchas; as the reader will find by comparing the two accounts together. Le Long firſt gives us an extract from a letter written by Gozani the Jeſuit in the city *Cai-fum-fou* in the year 1704: and from this letter the account is taken, that we find in the collection of voyages and travels printed in 1747, vol. iv. pag. 226. 227, which is another of your authorities for giving this pentateuch a place in your catalogue. Gozani gives an account of this MS, and of the twelve copies, which you mention; and Le Long, after quoting as much of it, as he thought proper, goes on thus ——— "Nicolaus Trigautius "in commentariis Matthæi Riccii lib. 1. de chri-"ſtiana expeditione apud Sinas cap. undecimo *de* "*hoc codice* ita loquitur: Judæus quidam natione et "profeſſione ad P. Matthæum Riccium viſitandum "venit, fama illius permotus. — Is in provincia *Ho-*"*nan* in ejus metropoli *Chain-fam-fu* natus, *Ngai* "cognomento dicebatur. — Ex hoc audierunt noſtri, "in ea quam dixi metropoli decem duodecimve Iſra-"elitarum eſſe familias et ſynagogam perelegantem, "quam nuper decem aureorum millibus inſtaurarant. "In ea ſe quinque libros Moyſis, videlicet pentateu-"chum, voluminibus involutis magna veneratione "annos jam quingentos aut ſexcentos aſſervare. (*Hæc* "*ſcribebat Matthæus Riccius circa annum* 1600)— "Triennio ergo poſt, neque enim citius licuit, P. Mat-"thæus Riccius unum e noſtris fratribus, Sinam na-"tione, in eam metropolim miſit, ut inverſtigaret,

" quam vera Iſraelita ille retuliſſet. Exſcribi etiam " ſibi fecit initia librorum et extrema, quos in ſua " ſynagoga aſſervabant, hæc deinde cum pentateucho " noſtro contulimus, et eadem eſſe reperimus, et eoſ- " dem characteres, niſi quod antiquo more punctis " carerent."

You ſay, [a] that " no one MS is inſerted" [into your catalogue] " without authority." Now I ſhould be glad to know, what authority you had to inſert that Bible at *Pekin* — Library called Fan-King-Tchang. —The ſame account, which in Le Long proves only the exiſtence of a pentateuch at Cai-Fong-Fu, will not, when you find it in Purchas, prove the exiſtence of a bible at Pekin. You have therefore inſerted this bible without any authority, or however without referring to any, which will prove its exiſtence; unleſs you have found a volume of Purchas's relations, which neither I nor any one elſe, that I can meet with, ever heard of. You add that " whatever errors may be " found as to the foreign MSS, they will be carefully " corrected; if the learned abroad will favour you " with the diſcovery of them." But here, as far as I can find, is an error as to a foreign MS, either in the title of it and the place where it is, or elſe in the reference to the authority, upon which you have inſerted it into your catalogue; which error may be corrected without calling in the help of the learned abroad.

You declare too, that " you will be thankful for " the notice of *any other* MSS of the Hebrew bible, " which are not enumerated in your catalogue." Be pleaſed therefore to [b] look into the general catalogue of MSS in England and Ireland, which was printed at Oxford in the year 1697, where you will find in the library of Trinity College in this Univerſity, that, beſides the MS of the Pſalms marked R. 8. 6. in your firſt [c] diſſertation, and in the concluding catalogue of your ſecond, there are in the ſame library two Hebrew MSS

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 517. [b] Catal. MSS &c. pars altera &c. pag. 100. N°. 540.—pag. 98. N°. 438. Diſſ. 1. pag. 342.

MSS, one of Iſaiah the other of the Proverbs. Theſe two were found very readily for me, when I deſired to borrow them a few months ago: and I make no doubt, but that, if you had enquired after them, they would have been found as readily for you. All the three MSS ſtand very near to one another: their marks are—R. 8. 2.—R. 8. 6.—R. 8. 35. The MS of Iſaiah is, I believe, a very modern one. But there is good reaſon to think, that the MS of the Proverbs is older than ſome, which you have deſcribed in your firſt diſſertation, and have honoured in your ſecond with a place in your catalogue. There are likewiſe in the ſame general catalogue [c] amongſt the MSS of the Norfolk library two Hebrew ones, which are thus deſcribed, 3373. 474. *Pentateuch. Moyſis et Haphtaroth* — 3389. 490. *Biblia hebraica, &c. (abeſt pentateuchus.)* Whether theſe are at preſent to be found or not, is more than I know: but certainly in your catalogue there is no MS, which agrees to the deſcription of either of them, and appears ever to have belonged to this library.

I ſhall leave it to you to chuſe, whether you will conſider what I have been ſaying about *ſome* MSS not mentioned in your catalogue, as notices, for which, in conſequence of what you have declared, you ought to be thankful; or as one of the inſtances, which joined to many others, gave me occaſion to ſay, that your book is injudicious and inaccurate. But if you ſhould be diſpoſed to thank me for endeavouring to add ſome MSS to your catalogue; I cannot expect your thanks for endeavouring to take from it the MS at Pekin.

There is in your book, [d] a liſt of men "of very "eminent learning, who have (during the preſent "century) contributed by their excellent obſervations, "towards the removal of that injurious prejudice, "which has ſo long and ſo amazingly obtained, as to "the perfection of the printed Hebrew text." As you have not promiſed your thanks to any one, who will encreaſe this liſt for you, as you have to any one, who

[c] Tom. ſecund. MSS in biblioth. Norfolc. in colleg. Greſham. pag. 83. [d] Diſſ. 2. pag. 492. &c.

will give you notice of any other Hebrew MS of the bible, beſides thoſe, which are contained in your catalogue; I have no reaſon to expect, that you will thank me if I ſhould mention a name or two, which you may add to it. However I will venture. And if inſtead of thinking yourſelf obliged to me, you ſhould be pleaſed to ſuppoſe, that I deſign this as another inſtance of the inaccuracy of your book, I cannot help it. If you are ever diſpoſed to extend your liſt into the laſt century, you may add to it,

1634. Mr. Mede, Book iii. pag. 569. 570. Reſpons. ad animadvers. Lud. de Dieu.

And in the preſent century you may add,

1721. Dr. Mangey's diſcourſes on the Lord's prayer, pag. 66, in the Note. The edition referred to is the third.

When at page 576 you were improving your liſt, and ſay, that "between the lines 17 and 18 [of "page 493] may be added *Mr. Langfords objec-* "*tions to* (Mr. Manns) *critical notes*;" as you had theſe critical notes in your mind, and ſpeak of Mr. Mann as the author of them without any heſitatation, I wonder, that you did not obſerve, that your liſt might have been farther improved by adding.

1747. Critical notes on ſome paſſages of ſcripture (by Mr. Mann.)

But let us return from this long digreſſion to our enquiry; Who were the corrupters of Deut. xxvii. 4. — If any one ſhould object, that "[e] the hatred of the "Samaritans might urge *them* to commit any crime "out of oppoſition to the Jews; you reply, that cer- "tainly the hatred of the Jews is at leaſt equally no- "torious." Thus far I agree with you, that from the mutual hatred of the two nations towards each other, we cannot determine, which of the two corrupted the text in queſtion: becauſe, as far as appears, this hatred was equal on both ſides. But, after obſerving what has been conſidered [f] already, that "upon the Jews re- "turning from their captivity, the Samaritans civilly offer-

[e] Diſſ. 2. pag. 59. 60. 61. [f] See pag. 50.

" offered to unite with them, ſaying — *let us build the* " *temple with you, for we ſeek your God, &c.* which " kind and religious propoſal was roughly rejected;" you add, " that the phraſe in our Saviours time was, " not—the Samaritans have no dealings with the Jews " — but — the Jews have no dealings with the Sama- " ritans." — and then you refer to Chryſoſtom on Joh. iv. 9. where he writes, ου γαρ ειπεν, ὁτι Σαμαρειται τοις ιυδαιοις ου συγχρωνται. If you meant by this to intimate, that the hatred of the Jews towards the Samaritans, which you had before repreſented to be *at leaſt equally* notorious with the hatred of the Samaritans towards the Jews, was in fact greater; a ſmall degree of attention would have helped you to a better teſtimony than Chryſoſtoms, to prove, that as in our Saviours time St. John ſays — " the Jews " have no dealing with the Samaritans;" — ſo the converſe of it — the Samaritans have no dealings with the Jews,—if it was not *the common phraſe* was equally true: for St. Luke [g] writes, that " the Samaritans of a certain village refuſed to receive our Saviour, be- cauſe they found, that he was going to Jeruſalem."

There is a farther uſe, which you might have made of this ſhort hiſtory in St. Lukes goſpel. You might have enquired, whether the inhoſpitality of theſe Samaritans is not a ſtronger evidence to prove, that in the age of Chriſt they were in general people of a bad diſpoſition, than the gratitude of the Samaritan leper, and the charity of the Samaritan in the parable are to prove the contrary. Certainly an accurate man, when he was endeavouring to determine what was their general character in that age, would not have overlooked this remarkable fact.

Mr. Whiſtons 5th argument is, " [h] That he ſees " no other ſufficient reaſon for the Samaritans choice " of mount Gerizim before mount Ebal, but be- " cauſe the antient place for worſhip was in their old " genuine copies Gerizim and not Ebal. For had it

 " been

[g] Luke ix. 51---53. [h] Eſſay &c. pag. 170.

" been otherwiſe, they would naturally have made " choice of Ebal, which was but a little way from " Shechem and Gerizim, and recommended by their " pentateuch: which would in that caſe, have ſerved " their turn as well as the other." This writer ſeems to have been aware of what I will ſhew you preſently, that Maundrells teſtimony, inſtead of proving that Gerizim is cloathed with a *beautiful verdure*, proves the contrary; and was contented with what the ſcriptures relate, that Abraham built his firſt altar at the place of Sichem, nor had found out, that *at the place of Shechem* meant *upon mount Gerizim:* he might therefore be at a loſs for a reaſon, why the Samaritans, when they were building a temple, ſhould give this mountain the preference, if it had not been the antient place of worſhip. But one would think, that when you argue in the ſame manner with him, you had forgotten yourſelf. If you had, Philalethes's anſwer [i] may remind you, that it muſt be ſtrange, if you, who inſiſt upon the beauty and fertility of Gerizim, and who imagine it to have been the place, where Abrahams firſt altar ſtood, ſhould not be able to find any other reaſon, which could determine them to build their temple upon it, beſides its having been the place where Joſhua and the Iſraelites, at their entrance into Canaan, built their firſt altar, and ſhould aſk; " [l] would " not they [the Samaritans] prefer *that mountain*, " which had been of old by Gods command, the " place of Gods worſhip; as the two mountains were " near together, both in the tribe of Ephraim, and " both therefore in their poſſeſſion, ſo that they might " chooſe which they pleaſed to erect their temple up- " on?" For though Ebal had been the mount of the altar built by Joſhua; yet if Gerizim was, as you ſuppoſe it to have been, the place of Abrahams firſt altar, and was, as you likewiſe ſuppoſe it to be, cloathed with a *beautiful verdure*, whilſt Ebal was a barren

[i] Library, &c. Numb. iv. pag. 202. [k] Diſſ. 2. pag. 36. 117. [l] Diſſ. 2. pag. 36.

barren rock; this double advantage of mount Gerizim would, when the Samaritans were to chuſe a place for their temple, have been likely to outweigh the ſingle recommendation of mount Ebal.

However, whether this difficulty be propoſed by you or by Mr. Whiſton; till I ſee reaſon for having a better opinion, than I have at preſent, of the religion of Sanballat and Manaſſeh, I ſhall think, that, when they were building a temple in direct oppoſition to the appointment of God, who had firſt commanded the Iſraelites to perform all their ſtated ſacrifices at the place, which he ſhould chuſe, and had afterwards choſen Jeruſalem; there was no occaſion for any other motive to determine them to place it on Gerizim, beſides the mere convenience of its being ſomething nearer to Shechem, if it was built upon this mountain, than it would have been, if they had built it upon the other.

In the ſixth place Mr. Whiſton ſays, "[m] It ſeems to "him, that Joſephus, the Jewiſh hiſtorian read in his "Hebrew copy the ſame, that the Samaritans ſtill "read in theirs; and to have had here Gerizim and "not Ebal. For he informs us, that this altar was "in a plain, between mount Gerizim and mount "Ebal, and particularly not far from Sichem: which "laſt deſignation of the place is in the Samaritan "copy, but omitted in the Hebrew; and is agreeable to the ſituation of mount Gerizim, which was "cloſe by Sichem. He alſo takes particular notice, "for which the Scripture here gave him no occaſion, "that ſuch oblations were never to be made there "any more after that day; as it were to guard againſt "ſuch an inference, as the ſituation of this altar, by "mount Gerizim, gave then an handle for among "the Samaritans. 'Tis true Joſephus's preſent copies "are made, [n] a good while afterward, to ſay, agreeably

[m] Eſſay, &c. pag. 170. Joſeph. antiq. per Havercamp. L. iv. c. 8. S. 44. [n] Antiq. L. v. c. 1. S. 19.

" bly to our preſent Hebrew, that this altar was on " mount Ebal. But this directly contradicting what " he had before ſaid, that it was between the two " mountains, and near Sichem, may juſtly be ſuſ- " pected as an interpolation, or correction, to favour " the preſent Hebrew and Greek copies; which has " not very ſeldom been the caſe with antient authors. " Nor does the entire context in this latter place, if " compared with the other above, well agree to the " ſame." —— Your readers, by comparing what I have here tranſcribed from Mr. Whiſton with your diſſertation from page 61 to page 66, will ſee how much you are obliged to him without mentioning his name. But I ſhall in ſome meaſure ſave them that trouble by tranſcribing, as I go along, the principal parts of this argument, as they ſtand in your book.

Joſephus in the tranſlation, which you quote, " ſpeaking of the command of God, by Moſes, " ſays — Aram extruere juſſit ad ſolem orientem " verſam, non procul ab urbe Sicimorum, inter duos " montes, [μεταξυ δυοιν ορουν] Garizæo ad dextram " poſito, ad lævam autem Gibalo."—Your comment is, — " here he aſſerts, that the altar, though not to " be upon Gerizim, was *not to be upon Ebal*, but " between both, and rather nearer to Gerizim as be- " ing *not far from Sichem* at the foot of Gerizim.— " Whereas if the old Hebrew MSS did read *Ebal*, " it can, in your opinion, ſcarce be conceived, that " ſuch a writer, who, as you had ſaid before, was " *hoſtis Samaritanorum infenſiſſimus*, would not have " fixed this altar there with the greateſt degree of " accuracy."

One cannot help remembering here an exception which you make [o] againſt the authority of the LXX and other antient verſions on this queſtion, about the true reading of Deut. xxvii. 4.—" Were the queſtion, " you ſay, concerning a corruption introduced 600 *years*

[o] Diſſ. 2. pag. 28. 29.

" *years after Chriſt*, our antient verſions had then " been proper evidences. But as the queſtion is con- " cerning a corruption introduced about 400 *years* " *before Chriſt*, you cannot ſee, how theſe verſions " can be of any uſe, ſince they are all *too late* to be " proper evidences. This, you ſay, will upon re- " flection be readily allowed, as to all; excepting the " Greek verſion — and this verſion of the pentateuch " is allowed to have been made about 280 years be- " fore Chriſt. But ſure a verſion, made by *Jews* an " hundred years after the wilful corruption of this " text, can be no proper proof, that this text of the " *Jews* had not been altered by *themſelves* one hun- " dred years before." Here are two exceptions againſt the evidence of the LXX verſion: the former, that it was made by Jews, who are no better evidence for themſelves in their own cauſe, than the Samaritans are againſt them. This exception indeed is not applicable to the caſe of Joſephus, whoſe evidence, if he gives any in favour of the Samaritans, will be ſo much the ſtronger, as he was their bitter enemy. But you inſiſt very particularly upon the other exception; that the MSS were corrupted before the time of making any antient verſion: for thus you go on —— " There " can be no reaſonable doubt, but that this corrup- " tion was made, either by the Samaritans—or by the " Jews—ſoon after the temple of the former was " built. And it was built as Prideaux allows—about " 409 years before Chriſt. All the antient verſions " therefore, which have been made from the Hebrew " text being made after the corruption had been in- " troduced, are too late to be admitted as evidences, " that can acquit the Jews or convict the Samari- " tans." Thus when you want to ſet aſide the evidence of the LXX verſion; *the Hebrew MSS were corrupted and read Ebal* Deut. xxvii. 4, *before that verſion was made.* But when you want to make uſe of the evidence of Joſephus; *the old MSS in his time*, that is about 350 years afterwards, *read Gerizim.*

Let

Let us next enquire, what ſort of an evidence you collect from Joſephus to prove, that the old Hebrew MSS in his time read *Gerizim.* " Why ; he aſſerts, " that the altar, though not to be upon Gerizim, " was *not to be upon Ebal.*" When you ſay, that he aſſerts this, you can only mean, that he aſſerts it by implication, when he ſays, according to your account, that it was to be between both. And juſt in the ſame manner I can prove, that in his time the old Hebrew MSS read *Ebal:* becauſe he aſſerts that the altar, though not to be upon Ebal, was *not to be upon Gerizim.* So that his evidence determines nothing. Yes ; you ſay, " if the antient MSS in the days of " Joſephus had read *Ebal,* we ſhould doubtleſs have " found him moſt poſitive and expreſs, that the altar " was to be, and was, built upon Ebal: for can it " poſſibly be ſuppoſed, that this acute and learned " advocate for the Jews, after ſo much ſharp conten- " tion with the Samaritans, would ſo expreſly have " given up the honour of Ebal, if he could *fairly* " have ſupported it ?"—You muſt ſuppoſe Joſephus to have had a very capricious conſcience, if it would ſuffer him to deſcribe this altar in ſuch a manner as neceſſarily implies, that it was not upon Gerizim, in direct oppoſition to what he judged to be true, and yet at the ſame time would not ſuffer him to place it upon Ebal, where he would have been glad to place it. Truly it was a ſingular piece of caſuiſtry in this *acute and learned Jew,* when he was convinced that the altar was upon Gerizim, and wiſhed, that it had been upon Ebal, to compromiſe the matter between his conviction and his wiſhes by placing it neither upon Gerizim nor upon Ebal, but between both.

However, according to your account he leaned a ittle more to what you think was the truth, than he did to his national prejudice: " for he placed the " altar *rather nearer to Gerizim,* as being *not far* " *from Sichem* at the foot of Gerizim." Perhaps you did not recollect here or had not obſerved, that, in the

the Samaritan pentateuch, at leaſt as it is printed in the French and Engliſh polyglotts, *near Sichem*, is not only uſed as the peculiar mark of Gerizim, as at Exodus xx. 17, "*This mountain* [הַהָר הַהוּא] is on the other ſide Jordan by the way where the ſun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champian, over-againſt Gilgal, beſide the oak of Moreh, *near Sichem*;" but it is likewiſe uſed as the common mark of both mountains, for thus they are deſcribed in this pentateuch, Deut. xi. 30. "Are *they* [הֵם] not on the other ſide Jordan by the way where the ſun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champian, over-againſt Gilgal, beſide the oak of Moreh, *near Sichem?*"—So that for any thing, which appears to the contrary, Joſephus's conſcience might balance the matter ſo nicely between the mountain, on which he wiſhed to place the altar, and the mountain, on which you ſuppoſe him to know, that it was placed in fact, as to direct him to lean no more towards one, than towards the other, but to repreſent it as placed exactly in the middle between them.

But pray let me aſk you, what edition of Joſephus's works you followed; when, in the quotation above, you made a comma after the word *Sicimorum?* In Havercamps edition, and in three more, which I have conſulted on this occaſion, the paſſage is thus pointed in the tranſlation — Aram extruere juſſit ad ſolem orientem verſam, non procul ab urbe Sicimorum inter duos montes, Garizæo ad dextram poſito, ad lævam autem eo, qui Gibalus nominatur — and the ſame pointing is obſerved in the original. Now as there is no ſtop after *Sicimorum*, it is plain, that the editors, not having found out the capriciouſneſs of Joſephus's conſcience in this inſtance, thought that —*inter duos montes*--was deſigned to mark out the ſituation of the city of the Sichemites: but you to countenance the turn, which you have given to the words —*inter duos montes*—and to make them appear to be

a

a deſignation of the place, where the altar ſtood, have inſerted a ſtop there.

You obſerve farther, " that Joſephus had the con-
" troverſy about Gerizim and Ebal full in view, when
" he adds, but a few lines after" thoſe, which we have been conſidering, — " ubi populo denunciat, ut
" holocauſta offerat; et poſt illum diem nunquam
" aliam victimam ei imponeret; non enim eſſe lici-
" tum: — a prohibition, you ſay, unauthorized by
" holy ſcripture, and therefore manifeſtly the reſult
" of Jewiſh hatred."—Mr. Whiſton does not venture to affirm as you do, *that this prohibition was unauthorized by ſcripture*, without adding any reſtriction; he only ſays, that Joſephus *takes particular notice, for which the ſcripture* here *gave him no occaſion*, that ſuch oblations were never to be made there any more.—But what if no ſuch prohibition is mentioned in that part of Scripture, from whence Joſephus was copying the commands of Moſes, which related to the religious ſervice to be performed on this altar at the time of building it? yet if the fact be true, that there is ſuch a prohibition any where elſe in the law of Moſes; you ought not to ſay, that it is unauthorized by Scripture, nor that it is manifeſtly the reſult of Jewiſh malice. Now as Joſephus, according to your comment, *affirms*, that the altar was not to be built on Ebal, by writing, as you ſuppoſe him to have done, that it was built in the middle between Gerizim and Ebal; juſt ſo the law of Moſes, if not in direct words, yet by neceſſary conſequence, *forbad* the Iſraelites offering any ſtated ſacrifices upon this altar for the future: becauſe, as we have [p] ſeen, it commanded them to offer their ſacrifices only at one certain place; and this place was never either on Gerizim or on Ebal.

After thus taking a view of the command as it ſtands in Joſephus, you next enquire, " how he ſtates
" the fact, and whether he informs us clearly, that
Joſhua

[p] At pag. 20.

" Joſhua did build the altar upon Ebal. The Greek " text is, και χωρησας εντευθεν επι Σικιμων συν απαντι " τω λαω, βωμον τε ιϛησιν οπη προειπε Μωυσης· και " νειμας την ϛρατιαν, επι μεν τω Γαριζει ορει την ημισειαν " ιϛησιν, επι δε τω Γιβαλω την ημισειαν, εν ω και ο βωμος " ϛι, και το Λευιτικον και τους ιερεας. — Atque inde " cum omni populo Sicima profectus, et altare ſtatuit " ubi Moyſes præceperat, &c. Having laid thus much of the tranſlation before your readers, you aſk, " Whether this author could have avoided mention- " ing Ebal *here*, if he had thought *that* to have been " the place?" To this queſtion two or three pages afterwards you give the following anſwer: — " To " ſpeak the truth; this diſcerning Jew ſeems con- " vinced, — that the altar was to be and was erected " on *Gerizim*, and therefore though he *could not* give " the honour to *Ebal* he *would not* confirm it to *Geri-* " *zim*; which yet will be inferred by moſt of his " readers from his ſaying ſo cautiouſly — that Joſhua " erected it *where* Moſes commanded." One would ſcarce think this inference to be ſo obvious, that moſt of his readers will make it; ſince it was not made by Mr. Whiſton, whoſe ſagacity has furniſhed you with almoſt all the arguments, which you have made uſe of in ſupport of your charge againſt the Jews of having corrupted Deut. xxvii. 4; notwithſtanding we are ſure that, whilſt he was endeavouring to ſupport the ſame charge, he had this paſſage before him; becauſe he has quoted it. Nor indeed could any one have made this diſcovery, unleſs he had been as well acquainted, as you ſeem to be, with the workings of Joſephus's conſcience: for when his ſcruples in the laſt chapter of his fourth book, had riſen no higher than to prevent him from placing the altar upon Ebal, whilſt they allowed him to ſay, according to your interpretation, that it was to be built between Gerizim and Ebal, and ſo to affirm by neceſſary conſequence, that it was not to be built upon Gerizim; who, that did not know the workings of his conſcience, could have imagined

theſe

theſe ſcruples in the firſt chapter of his fifth book to be riſen ſo high, that, though he would not ſay any thing, which might confirm the honour of the altar to Gerizim, yet he would not venture to ſay any thing, which might deprive it of this honour; and therefore choſe only to ſay, that Joſhua erected it *where* Moſes had commanded it. Common readers, who had interpreted the former paſſage in Joſephus, as you have done, and ſuppoſed his meaning to be, that the place, which Moſes aſſigned for the altar, was between Gerizim and Ebal, when they read in the next chapter, that Joſhua did erect it *where* Moſes had commanded, would be apt to imagine that the place, which he meant, was the ſame, which he had deſcribed before, and that the altar was erected between the two mountains. Unleſs they ſhould happen to meet with any thing in this latter paſſage, which might correct their interpretation of the former.

We ſhall find that this might be the very caſe; if we take a view of the whole ſentence of Joſephus —— Atque inde cum omni populo Sicima profectus et altare ſtatuit ubi Moyſes præceperat; et dein exercitu diviſo, in monte quidem Garizi dimidium ejus conſtituit, in Gibalo vero dimidium, in quo et altare eſt, et Levitas et Sacerdotes."——Ebal is here expreſsly mentioned as the mountain of the altar. — "True, ſay you, but the mention made of it is in "ſo odd a manner, and the ſentence is ſo confuſed "by means of the words εν ῳ και ο βωμος εϛι, even "though they ſhould be placed in a parentheſis, that "it may be ſubmitted to the learned, *whether thoſe* "*words are not an interpolation.* For having told us, "that the altar was erected upon its proper ſpot, at "the very place, which Moſes had commanded; "could he thruſt in the mention of it again afterwards, and in a part of the ſentence, where the inſertion is not natural, and perplexes the ſenſe?" But if the inſertion of the words — εν ῳ και ο βωμος εϛι, *in quo altare eſt* — appear to you to be unnatural

and to perplex the ſenſe; is it a neceſſary conſequence, that they have been interpolated? for muſt all words in Joſephus, which ſeem to you to make the conſtruction a little perplexed, be immediately rejected as interpolations? And is not it ſo much a matter of taſte, whether the inſertion of theſe particular words is, or is not, natural, as to leave us room to diſpute about it for ever, without being able to come to a determination? Accordingly we find, that in the opinion of Philalethes, "[q] the mention of the altars "ſituation ſeems to be introduced very eaſily and "without any force or conſtraint." [r] You charge him indeed "with *omitting the very words*, on which "your ſuppoſition of an interpolation is chiefly "grounded." But whatever words he may have omitted in *his* quotation, he had certainly *your* whole quotation before him, when he judged, that the words εν ῳ και ο ϛωμος εϛι are naturally introduced. And if you had not told him, that your ſuppoſition, that the words: — εν ῳ και ο ϛωμος εϛι — are an interpolation, was chiefly grounded on ſome words, which he has omitted, I ſhould have thought, and perhaps your readers may be ſtill diſpoſed to think, that you did not depend ſo much upon this matter of taſte, as upon another topic, with which Whiſton furniſhed you. For as if you were aware, that there is room for endleſs diſpute, whether the inſertion of theſe words is, or is not, natural, you add–"If any one ſhould "ſtill inſiſt, that the words, objected to, have not been "thruſt in aukwardly by ſome later Jewiſh zealot, but "muſt have been the words of Joſephus; then you "anſwer that HE FLATLY CONTRADICTS HIMSELF." I have two reaſons for thinking, that you depended chiefly upon this argument, which you borrowed as uſual, and put off for your own: one is, that you have printed it in capitals; and the other is, that you bring it in as a reſerve, in caſe the other is not ſatisfactory.

But

[q] Library, &c. N. iv. pag. 207. 208.
[r] Library, &c. N°. v. 263.

But there is another way of reconciling Joſephus to himſelf. This *flat contradiction* might have given you a hint, that in the paſſage, which you quote from the laſt chapter of the fourth book you ſhould blot out the comma immediately after the word *Sicimorum*, and correct your interpretation: for if Joſephus there meant, as the editors of his works have commonly underſtood him to mean, that Moſes commanded the altar to be built near the city of Sichem, which ſtands between the two mountains, Gerizim on the ſouth-ſide and Ebal on the north-ſide; [s] there will be no contradiction in his ſaying afterwards, that Ebal was the mount, on which Joſhua erected this altar. [t] Philalethes has ſhewn you, that theſe two paſſages in Joſephus, in which the place of the altar is deſcribed, might be reconciled in this manner. The reader may perhaps, by this time, be able to gueſs what reaſon you had for charging him with omitting the words, on which you are pleaſed to ſay, that your ſuppoſition of an interpolation was chiefly grounded, inſtead of giving a direct anſwer to this part of his letter.

"You make one more remark on that paſſage in "the ivth book, where Joſephus ſpeaks of the com-"mand given by Moſes; which in your opinion is "farther favourable to mount Gerizim." That the reader may ſee, how judiciouſly you argue from what you find in Joſephus, when you have not Mr. Whiſton to guide you, I will tranſcribe the whole of it—"Had "Joſephus ſaid, that Ebal was to be the place, from "whence they were to declare the curſe of God "againſt all ſuch as ſhould neglect *Gods worſhip*, and "forget *his commands*; this would have been urged "as a clear alluſion to *the altar* and *the law*, as be-"ing upon Ebal." I cannot help obſerving by the way, that whoever had urged this muſt have been very inattentive, if he did not ſee, that the bleſſings, which

[s] See Library, &c. N°. iv. pag. 208.
[t] Library, &c. N°. iv. pag. 208. N°. v. pag. 263.

which were to be declared from Gerizim, correſponded to theſe curſes, and conſequently were promiſed to ſuch, as ſhould be careful *to worſhip God* and *to obey his commands*; or he muſt have been very unfair, if he did ſee this, and yet concealed it; or he muſt have been very injudicious, if he did not underſtand, that it would deſtroy his argument. You however go on thus—"It muſt then be equally fair," and you might have added equally accurate and judicious, "to infer, "that Joſephus alludes to *the altar* and *the law* as "being upon mount Gerizim; ſince, expreſly ſpeaking of Gerizim, he mentions *the worſhip of God* and "*keeping his laws* — και πρωτα μεν τυς επι τω Γαριζειν "γενομενυς ευχεσθαι τα καλλιστα τοις περι την θρησκειαν "τυ Θευ και την των νομων φυλακην σπυδαζυσιν." The reader would have known at once what to think of your inference; if you had not over-looked or deſignedly omitted what follows in the next ſentence — επειτα τοις καλα ταυτα παραβησομενοις καλαρας τιθεσθαι

Mr. Whiſton on a ſpare page, which is oppoſite to the firſt page of his Eſſay, has this ſeventh argument — "What ſeems to me to determine this point "in favour of the Samaritans is this, [a] That when "theſe Jews had a public diſputation at Alexandria, "before Ptolemy Philometor, and his nobles, con"cerning this very queſtion, whether by the Moſaic "law the Jewiſh temple was to be built at Jeruſalem "or at mount Gerizim? the Samaritans, Sabbæus "and Theodoſius, undertook at the peril of their "lives to prove thence, that it was to be built, not "at Jeruſalem, but at mount Gerizim. Which they "would hardly have done, if the Jewiſh pentateuch "had at that time expreſly differed from the Sama"ritan, as to theſe texts, which were the only ones, "which they ever alledged on their ſide. Nor does "the proceeding of the Jewiſh diſputants at all imply, "that they denied this plea of the Samaritans; but rather

[a] Joſeph. antiq. L. xiii. c. iii. S. 4.

" rather that they owned it. For Jeruſalem being
" never named in Moſes's law, they were driven to
" alledge for themſelves, beſides the general expreſ-
" ſions in the law of *a place, that God ſhould chuſe*,
" only immemorial tradition, and the honour their
" temple had always received from the conſtant ſuc-
" ceſſion of their high-prieſts there, and from the
" preſents made to it by the gentile kings; while
" the Samaritans temple was ſo obſcure, as to be
" taken little or no notice of by any: which could not
" eaſily have been the caſe, had the Jewiſh copies
" diſagreed from the Samaritan in this fundamental
" point, as they now do. Nor is it likely, that, if
" Joſephus's copy of the pentateuch had differed
" from that of the Samaritans, as to this matter, he
" would have omitted hinting the ſame difference to
" us in this place; as the foundation of that later
" quarrel there had for ſeveral ages been between the
" Jews and Samaritans about the place appointed by
" God for the national Jewiſh worſhip". [b] You quote the hiſtory of this fact at large, as it is related by Joſephus; and becauſe Ptolemy is ſaid to have decreed, — " That building the temple at Jeruſalem
" was authorized by the law of Moſes; and that the
" Samaritans [who came to plead for *their* temple]
" ſhould be put to death; notwithſtanding it does
" not appear from the hiſtory that theſe Samaritan
" advocates pleaded at all:" You cry out — " was
" there ever a decree more unrighteous, than thus to
" ſentence men to death, *unheard?*" Well then; we will allow Ptolemy to have been an unrighteous judge; and for that reaſon, inſtead of making uſe of his authority in favour of the Hebrew reading of Deut. xxvii. 4, we will go on to enquire what you can collect from this hiſtory, as Joſephus relates it, which tends to ſhew, that the Samaritan reading is not a corruption. — " After all, ſay you, where is the
" force of the Jewiſh evidences? Both parties had ſworn

[b] Diſſ. 2. pag. 69. &c.

" ſworn to confine themſelves to the Moſaic law; but " the Jews did not: and if they had, *where* in all the " pentateuch, is there the leaſt authority for building " a temple at Jeruſalem. — " Certainly, moſt readers " will infer [from this ſtory] a matter of great con- " ſequence to the point here in view, that the Sama- " ritans did not corrupt the text in queſtion; becauſe " the Jews did not, at that time, attempt to convict " them of it." — When Joſephus relates, that both parties ſwore ποιησασθαι τας αποδειξεις καλα τον νομον, I ſhould be glad to know, whether you underſtand, that the Jews and the Samaritans reſpectively ſwore to bring all their proofs from the law, that is, from the pentateuch? The Latin verſion indeed in Havercamps edition ſays, — Seſe probationes allaturos e lege — but unleſs by *e lege* the tranſlator meant *ſecundum legem*, he did not render καλα τον νομον properly. A little lower in the ſame paragraph he gives the proper ſenſe to the words καλα τυς Μωυσεως νομυς, for he renders them *de ſententia Moyſis*. And though you ſay here, that " both parties had ſworn to confine " themſelves to the Moſaic law, but that the Jews " did not;" yet when at page 68 you are tranſlating this ſtory from Joſephus, you ſay yourſelf, that " both " parties ſwore, they would produce their proofs *ac-* " *cording* to the law." Now what ſort of arguments would you allow to be agreeable to the law, or according to the law? God had commanded in the law, that his ſtated worſhip ſhould be performed at a place of his own chuſing in one of the tribes of Iſrael. This the Samaritans could not deny, though, as I have ſhewn [c] already, they had corrupted their pentateuch and made it ſpeak, as if this place had been choſen in the life-time of Moſes. It being however a common principle of both parties, that according to the law Gods temple ought to ſtand, and his worſhip to be performed, at the place of his own chuſing; the Jews argued according

[c] See pag. 20—24.

cording to the law, as they had ſworn to do; if they firſt began from this common principle, which was laid down in the law; and then went on to ſhew from any other topics, that Jeruſalem was the place, which God had choſen: for any topics, which would prove, that God had choſen Jeruſalem for the place of his ſtated worſhip, would prove according to the law, that this was the place, where he ought to be worſhipped. This is the very method, which, as Joſephus tells us, Andronicus the Jewiſh advocate made uſe of: he began his proofs *from* the law, and then went on to urge the ſucceſſion of the high-prieſts, the great honours, which had been done to *their* temple by all the kings of Aſia, and the little regard, which had been ſhewn for the temple at Gerizim. He ſeems to have appealed to ſuch facts, as were probably at that time matter of public notoriety. And as a long ſucceſſion of high-prieſts might prove, that the temple at Jeruſalem was of greater antiquity than the other at Gerizim, and conſequently that God was worſhipped at the former, before he was worſhipped at the latter; ſo the regard, which the Aſiatic kings had always ſhewn for the temple at Jeruſalem, whilſt they took little or no notice of the other at Gerizim, might ſerve to ſhew, that foreigners, who were impartial witneſſes in the cauſe, had long conſidered the former as a place rightly dedicated to the ſervice of God in preference to the latter. But all this you call *a great deal of what was nothing to the purpoſe*. What ſort of evidence then would you have directed the Jews to bring, if you had been the judge inſtead of Ptolemy? Would you have had them produce the other books of the bible to prove Jeruſalem to be the place, which God had choſen to put his name there? The Samaritan advocates would have excepted to this evidence, becauſe their ſect, [d] as was obſerved above, rejected all thoſe other books. And you, for want of underſtanding the meaning of the oath, which both parties had taken,

[d] See pag. 24.

taken, would have admitted the exception, becauſe the evidence in queſtion is not to be found *any where in all the pentateuch.* Suppoſe then, that the Jews had produced their pentateuch, and ſhewn, that Ebal was the mountain, on which God in the law of Moſes had commanded the Iſraelites to build their firſt altar, as ſoon as they ſhould come into the land of Canaan. If they had done this; the Samaritans would have oppoſed their pentateuch to it, which affirms Gerizim to have been the mount of the altar; and we may ſee, at pages 27, and 32, of your diſſertation, what your judgment would have been in this caſe—You would have ſaid, that "here had plainly been "a wilful corruption on one ſide or on the other; "and that as the evidence of one pentateuch deſtroys "the evidence of the other, no certain argument, or "rather, no argument at all, can be drawn from it "to fix the corruption on either ſide."—At page 121, when the enquiry, which the Samaritan woman brought before our Saviour, was the ſame with this, which, if we may believe Joſephus, was brought before Ptolemy—*Whether Gerizim or Jeruſalem was the place where the Iſraelites ought to worſhip*—you ſay, that "this enquiry is not relative to the controverſy "between Gerizim and Ebal, but between Gerizim "and Jeruſalem:" if you had happened to be in the ſame humour, when this cauſe came before you, that you were, when you wrote this, you would have told the advocates on both ſides, that it was not worth the while to enter into this kind of evidence; becauſe whatever might be the reading at Deut. xxvii. 4, it was nothing to the purpoſe.—But at page 70, when you had put yourſelf into his place and were rehearing the cauſe, you were clearly of another mind, and underſtood, that the enquiry about Gerizim and Jeruſalem was ſo far relative to the controverſy between Gerizim and Ebal, that determining this controverſy in favour of Ebal would in neceſſary conſequence determine that enquiry in favour of Jeruſalem:

ſalem: for here you ſay, that "as the temple at Ge-
"rizim claimed only, in virtue of its former altar;
"prove that altar to have belonged to Ebal, and
"Gerizim is at once ſtripped of its borrowed ho-
"nours, and the Samaritans of courſe convicted."
You add, that if this corruption, of Deut. xxvii. 4,
had been made by the Samaritans, the Jews might
then have eaſily fixed it upon them. "For ſuppoſe
"it made immediately after the Gerizim-temple was
"built, about 400 years before Chriſt; and that this
"conteſt happened about 150 years before Chriſt,
"certainly the Jews had *then* MSS more than 250
"years old, probably ſome wrote hundreds of years
"before the building that temple, and therefore very
"long before the ſuppoſed corruption: and had *only*
"*one* old Heb. MS, I ſay had *only one* been produ-
"ced fairly reading עיבל [Ebal] in the text in queſ-
"tion; the Samaritans had been convicted righte-
"ouſly."—But do you remember, where this cauſe
was heard? Joſephus has laid the ſcene in Egypt, and
you agree to fix the time about 150 years before
Chriſt, that is, [c] about 130 years after the LXX ver-
ſion was made. Since therefore all the Jewiſh MSS
which were in Egypt, whether they were old or new
read Ebal, when this verſion was made, you have no
reaſon to think, that the Egyptian Jews had any MSS,
which read otherwiſe, 130 years afterwards. If there-
fore Ptolemy had cried out to Andronicus the advo-
cate for the Jews — bring me *only one* old Heb. MS,
I ſay *only one*, which fairly reads עיבל [Ebal] and I
will determine in your favour; — this advocate might
have replied,—all the MSS, which we can come at in
Egypt, read Ebal; and if you require us, to produce
older MSS, than we have now at hand; you muſt either
give us a longer day; or elſe you require what is un-
reaſonable. Suppoſe he had ſaid farther to Ptolemy,
— One of the MSS, which we have produced has the
very reading, which you want to ſee; there is no eraſe-
ment

[c] Diſſ. 2. pag. 28.

ment in it; and it is 280 years old; that is, it was written 30 years before the building of the temple on Gerizim; — if the Samaritan advocates had replied, that this MS was no more than 240 years old, and therefore ought not to be admitted as evidence, becauſe it was written 10 years after the corruption in queſtion was introduced; — the cauſe would thus have been put upon ſuch an iſſue, that Ptolemy, if he had been ever ſo well diſpoſed to do juſtice, would probably have been unable to determine it. For let us not forget, what you told us in your firſt diſſertation, that "[f] it is not eaſy to determine the age of the ſe-"veral Hebrew MSS, which we have at preſent, ex-"cepting a few, that are dated; and that it is per-"haps impoſſible to fix ſome to any particular cen-"tury; till ſuch marks for fixing their age, as you "there enumerate, have been more thoroughly exa-"mined." Do you think therefore that Ptolemy, who in all probability could not read Hebrew, and who can ſcarce be ſuppoſed to have learned, how to ſettle the age of Hebrew MSS with more exactneſs then, than you can now, would have directed, or would have ſuffered, ſuch evidence to be brought, as he could not judge of?

I have ſpent a good deal of time about this matter: but I ſhall not think it wholly waſted, if I have ſhewn; that, ſuppoſing any ſuch cauſe was ever brought before Ptolemy, the Jews appear from Joſephus's relation to have gone as far into the merits of it, according to the law of Moſes, as the circumſtances of their judge, of their antagoniſts, and of the country where they were, would admit of; and particularly that from their not attempting to convict the Samaritans of having corrupted their pentateuch, at Deut. xxvii. 4, you cannot infer, that the Samaritans did not corrupt it.

Though you here argue from the ſame fact with Whiſton, you have not borrowed or at leaſt have not en-

[f] Diſſ. 1. pag. 308.

enlarged upon all the arguments, which he deduces from it. But as I deſigned to conſider the merits of the queſtion about the corruption of Deut. xxvii. 4, whilſt I was ſhewing you ſome inſtances of inaccuracy and injudicious reaſoning in your defence of the Samaritan reading, it will be proper for me to take notice of them all.

Firſt, he thinks it reaſonable to imagine, that "if "the Jewiſh pentateuch had then differed from the "Samaritan in this text; the Samaritan advocates "Sabbæus and Theodoſius would not have under-"taken at the peril of their lives to prove from "thence, that the temple was to be built, not at Jeru-"ſalem, but at Gerizim." I ſhall paſs by for the preſent his ſuppoſing, like you, that to argue, as the two parties had ſworn to do, — *ex ſententia legis, according to the law* — was the ſame thing as ſwearing, that they would make uſe of no proofs but ſuch as ſhould be taken out of the pentateuch. But we may obſerve, that this argument will hold as ſtrongly the contrary way: for we may ſay, — If the Samaritan pentateuch had then differed from the Hebrew in this text, as it does now; it is reaſonable to imagine, that Andronicus the Jewiſh advocate would not have undertaken at the peril of his life to prove from thence, that the temple was to be built, not at Gerizim, but at Jeruſalem.

His ſecond argument is this, —— "If the Jewiſh "copies had not then been the ſame in this funda-"mental point with the Samaritans, we cannot eaſily "ſuppoſe, that the Jews would have alledged for "themſelves only immemorial tradition, and the ho-"nour, which had been done to it by all the kings of "Aſia." —— Here you have copied him pretty cloſely except firſt, that inſtead of ſpeaking, as he does, of the Jewiſh copies in general, you confine yourſelf to ſuch as were then above 250 years old; and ſecondly, you point out what ſort of evidence the Jews would probably have uſed, if theſe old MSS had not agreed with the Samaritan copies; whereas

he

he only ſhews what ſort of evidence according to his opinion, they would not have uſed, and ſeems to truſt, that from his manner of introducing his argument his readers will be able to find out the other. Whether the inconſiſtencies, which you have fallen into in managing this argument, are inaccuracies, and whether your reaſoning in it is judicious or not, our readers will judge.

In the third place he argues, that "if Joſephus's "copy of the pentateuch had differed from that of "the Samaritans, he would probably have ſaid ſo up-"on this occaſion." — Joſephus might perhaps have ſaid ſo, if he had been writing a diſſertation upon this ſubject: but when he was relating a matter of fact as he had heard it, his not ſaying this, will not outweigh [g] the reaſons, which we have for thinking, that the Hebrew copies in Joſephus's times had the ſame reading in this text, that they have at preſent.

We are now come to thoſe arguments in defence of the Samaritan reading, which [h] *Mr. Whiſton has not touched upon*, that is, to thoſe, which *you judge to be the ſtrongeſt*.

One of theſe arguments is, that "[a] when Jotham "made his *beautiful and ſolemn* oration to the men "of Shechem about 240 years after one of the "mountains had been *conſecrated*, he muſt at that "time know, which mountain had the law and the "altar. You would therefore ſuppoſe; that, to give "the greater weight to his addreſs, he would ſpeak "from thence: and 'tis certain, that he ſpoke from "Gerizim." Your readers may perhaps think, that the arguments, which *Whiſton touched upon*, and which you have borrowed from him, are *as ſtrong* as this; eſpecially if they obſerve, what you ſay in the next paragraph, that *Gerizim* was the mountain, which *adjoined to Sichem, or rather hung over it:* for when there is ſuch an obvious reaſon, why Jotham ſhould ſpeak from Gerizim rather than from Ebal, becauſe the former was

[g] See above at pag. 73. &c. [h] See above at pag. 6.
[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 38. Judg. ix. 7.—21.

was the mountain, from which the men of Sichem, to whom he was ſpeaking, could hear him the beſt; they will be apt to look upon what you ſay about his deſigning to give the greater weight to his addreſs by ſpeaking from what you call the *conſecrated* mountain, as a groundleſs refinement.

[b] Philalethes however, beſides giving you this anſwer, aſks "Whether ſuppoſing the two mountains "to have been equally commodious in other reſpects, "Jotham might not chuſe to harangue the Shechemites from the former, which was the mount of "bleſſing; that he might animate his friends with "ſtronger hopes of advantage from him, and ſtrike "his enemies with greater awe, by denouncing curſes "upon them, even from that privileged mount?" But for my own part, from Jothams ſtanding on Gerizim, whilſt he denounced a curſe againſt the men of Shechem, I ſhould rather conclude, that in his time this mount was not conſidered as a privileged place, that is, as a place, which was either peculiarly fitted in its own nature for the purpoſe of pronouncing bleſſings, or which Moſes by commanding, that the ſix tribes, who were to bleſs the Iſraelites, ſhould ſtand upon it, and Joſhua by executing this command, had appropriated to this purpoſe. You muſt have read Jothams *beautiful and ſolemn oration* very inattentively, if you have not obſerved, that it contains a *ſolemn curſe*: indeed the remark of the ſacred hiſtorian, that "[c] all the evil of the men of Shechem did God render upon their heads, and upon them came *the curſe of Jotham* the ſon of Jerubbaal," — would point this out to the moſt inattentive reader. Thus Jothams chuſing to ſpeak his oration from Gerizim, inſtead of furniſhing you with a new argument to prove, that this was the mount of the law and of the altar, might have helped to ſhew you, that though God by Moſes had commanded, that upon one occaſion ſolemn bleſſings ſhould be pronounced from this mountain; yet upon

[b] Library, &c. N°. iv. pag. 203. [c] Judg. ix. 57.

upon all other occaſions it was quite indifferent, whether bleſſings or curſes were pronounced from thence.

The prieſt of the Samaritans, whom [a] Maundrell viſited at Naploſe, charged the jews with malicioufly altering their text, and putting Ebal for Gerizim, Deut. xxvii. 4. To confirm this he made uſe of two arguments; one, that Ebal was the mountain of curſing, and Gerizim the mountain of bleſſing; the other, that Ebal is in its own nature an unpleaſant place, but Gerizim on the contrary is in itſelf fertile and delightful. The former of theſe arguments I have already conſidered: Mr. Whiſton paſſed over the latter of them, probably becauſe he thought it of no conſequence for a reaſon, which will appear preſently. But you ſay, [b] "that "the different nature of theſe mountains furniſhes "another *ſtrong* argument for the preference in fa"vour of Gerizim. For this mountain, ſtanding on "the ſouth with its ſurface declining towards the "north, is ſheltered from the heat of the ſun by its "own ſhade; whereas Ebal, looking ſouthward, is "more open to the ſun falling directly upon it. You "therefore think it no wonder, that the former ſhould "be *cloathed with a beautiful verdure*, while the ſur"face of the latter is more ſcorched up and unfruitful. "And then you go on to inform us, that this re"markable diſtinction is not only boaſted of by the "Samaritans themſelves, but noted alſo by Maundrell, "pag. 61, and other travellers." It muſt indeed be allowed, that the Samaritan prieſt repreſented Ebal as being in its own nature an unpleaſant place, and boaſted, as you do, of the fertility and delightfulneſs of Gerizim. But did Maundrell note *ſuch a remarkable diſtinction* as the prieſt ſet forth? or did he obſerve that *beautiful verdure*, with which you have cloathed your favourite mountain? I will tranſcribe his own words, that the reader may ſee, how far you have copied from him, and how far either through careleſs-

leſs

[a] Journey from Aleppo to Jeruſalem, pag. 60, &c.
[b] Diſſ. 2. pag. 36.

leſs or deſign you have ſuppoſed him to note more than he ſaw. — " We obſerved it, ſays he, to be *in* " *ſome meaſure true*, that which he [the prieſt] plead- " ed concerning the nature of both mountains; for " though *neither of the mountains has much to boaſt of* " *as to their pleaſantneſs*, yet as one paſſes between " them, Gerizim *ſeems to diſcover a ſomewhat more* " *verdant fruitful aſpect* than Ebal. The reaſon of " which may be, becauſe fronting towards the north, " it is ſheltered from the heat of the ſun by its own " ſhade: whereas Ebal looking ſouthward and re- " ceiving the ſun, that comes directly upon it, muſt " by conſequence be rendered more ſcorched and un- " fruitful." Thus what with you is *a beautiful ver-* *dure, which cloathes* Gerizim, is repreſented by him as a matter *but little to be boaſted of*, and only as *ſeeming to be a ſomewhat more verdant fruitful aſpect* than what Ebal has. If you had given your readers a true account of what Maundrell noted; they would have been likely to think, what Mr. Whiſton ſeems to have thought, when he neglected this argument, that a verdure, which could ſcarcely be diſcovered by any eyes, but thoſe of a Samaritan prieſt, is not a *ſtrong* argument, nor any argument at all, that Gerizim, and not Ebal, was the mountain, which God appointed for the ſacrifices and religious feſtival of the Iſraelites upon their entrance into Canaan.

Under this article [c] you quote Ludolfus's notes on the epiſtles of the Samaritans, which were ſent to him; where he ſays — " Retulit mihi Jacobus Levi Tome- " rita montem Garizim eſſe fertiliſſimum, fontibus " et ſcaturiginibus plurimis irriguum; montem He- " bal contra plane aridum et ſterilem eſſe. — After " which follows the inference of this great man, whoſe " ſurprize in your opinion was probably founded on " the common miſtake — Ubi pie mirari licet, cur " Deus in iſto maledictionis monte deſerto juſſerit ædi- " ficare altare; et ſacrificare holocauſta, ibique epu- " lari et lætari; et non potius in monte Garizim."— Theſe

[c] Diſſ. 2. p. 38.

Theſe notes were publiſhed in the year 1688; that is, 9 years before Maundrell viſited Naploſe, and [d]made ſuch enquiries of the Samaritans, as had been recommended to him by Ludolfus. If this great man lived to read his learned friends account of Gerizim and Ebal; his ſurprize was probably at an end.

" [e]Reland indeed, agreeably to what you ſay of " him, is of opinion, that the very names of Gerizim " and Ebal denote *fruitfulneſs* and *ſterility*: adding— " ipſa utriuſque montis facies benedictionem et ma- " ledictionem, in eo peragendam, luculenter exprimit. " He remarks alſo — montes in Palæſtina plurimi " triticum proferunt, et alias frumenti ſpecies; quæ " eſt eruditiſſimi Maundrelli, membri collegii Exo- " nienſis obſervatio." — You ſee, that Reland, though he thought, that the names Gerizim and Ebal denote what you imagine to be the different nature of theſe two mountains, and even quotes Maundrell for ſaying — that " many of the mountains of Paleſtine, " though improper for cattle, bear wheat and other " kinds of corn." — yet does not venture to produce him as a witneſs of the great fertility of mount Gerizim in particular. Indeed I have ſome doubt, whether Reland has not miſtaken Maundrell and quoted him, as if he had ſaid, many of the hills of Paleſtine *bear* wheat; where he is ſpeaking of them as having in former times ſerved very well for this purpoſe by means of ſuch a culture, as they then had. Reland has not referred to the paſſage, which he quotes; and I can find none, which is like it, but this — " [f]Than the plain country nothing can be more fruit- " ful, whether for the production of corn or cattle, " and conſequently milk. The hills, though impro- " per for all cattle, except goats, yet being diſpoſed " into ſuch beds as are afore deſcribed, *ſerved* very " well to bear corn, melons, &c, What ſort of culture this was will appear preſently, when I ſhall have oc-

[d] Journey, &c. pag. 60. [e] Diſſ. 2. pag. 37. vid. Rel. Diſſ. Miſcell. P. i. pag. 127. 128. [f] Maundrell pag. 67. 68.

occaſion to tranſcribe the whole account, which he has given us of the preſent condition of Paleſtine, and of what he judges to have been the condition of it formerly.

According to Relands etymology, which the Arabic language helped him to make out, mount *Gerizzim* is *mons meſſorum* — and the name *Ebal* denotes, that this mountain was ſo called *vel a ſterilitate vel a ſaxis*. It would have been very hard, if with Relands knowledge of the Hebrew and Arabic languages he could not have contrived to make theſe two names ſignify any thing, that he pleaſed. Let us try what may be done with the word Gerizim by the help of the Hebrew language only. I will ſet out as Reland does — The lexicons inform us, that גרז ſignifies *excidere, abſcindere*, that is, *to cut off*, or, as we learn from Pſal. xxxi. 23, *to deſtroy*. — "I ſaid in my haſte נגרזתי *I am cut off* before thine eyes." Mount Gerizim therefore is *mons abſciſſionum* the mountain where all things are deſtroyed and nothing will grow. To confirm this, you may obſerve, that גזר ſignifies *excidere, abſcindere* juſt as גרז does: and from גזר comes גזרה which is thus uſed, Levit. xvi. 22. "the goat ſhall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land גזרה *abſciſſam*;" that is, ſays Schindler, *abſciſſam ab habitatione et germinatione, in qua nemo habitat et nihil creſcit*. You probably think, that this etymology proves nothing. I think ſo too. And I have the ſame opinion of all ſuch uncertain etymologies, — of Relands amongſt the reſt.

Theodotus a very antient poet, whom Reland quotes from Euſebius, ſpeaks of both theſe mountains as being very fruitful, without making any diſtinction between them: but you, either through careleſsneſs or deſign, paſs this evidence over, and produce only ſuch as favour your own opinion. The paſſage in Reland is as follows, "[s] Concludam hanc diſſertationem [de "monte Garizim] fragmento antiquiſſimi ſcriptoris "The-

[s] Differt. miſcell. P. i. pag. 159.

" Theodoti in libro de Judæis, quod nobis Euſebius " in lib. de præpar. evang. ix. 22. conſervavit, quo " ſitum montium Garizim, Ebal, et urbis Sichem " deſcribit.

Η δ' αρ' εην αγαθητε και αιγονομος και υδρηλη,
Ουδε μεν ευκεν οδος δολιχη πολιν εισαφικεσθαι
Αγροθεν, ουδε ποτε [ποτι] δρια λαχνηεντα πονευσιν.
Εξ αυλης δε μαλ' αγχι ὀυ' ὑρεα φαινεῖ' ερυμνα
Ποιης τε πληθοντα και υλης. Των δε μεσηγυ
Ατραπιτος τετμηῖ' αραη αυλωπις. Εν δ' ετερωθι *
Η δ' ιερη Σικιμων καλαφαινεται, ιερον ας-υ,
Νερθεν υπο ριζη δεδμημενον. Αμφι δε τειχος
Λιστον υπωρειαν, υπο δ' εδραμεν αιποθεν ερχος.

" In quibus id mirum, utrumque montem tam Ebal " quam Garizim ab eo deſcribi ut fertilem, quum " alii Ebal ſterilem appellant, uti hodieque eſt."

Baſnage quotes as much of this paſſage, as relates to the fertility of the two mountains, and then goes on thus — " [h] ſhould we prefer the teſtimony of a " poet before an eye-witneſs, or ſay, that mount E- " bal, which is at preſent barren, has loſt its fruitful- " neſs? 'Tis more probable, that the poet took the " liberty to confound theſe two mountains, and gave " Ebal a fecundity not belonging to it, that he might " not diſgrace a country he was repreſenting as infi- " nitely fine. God choſe Ebal to pronounce the curſes " on, becauſe its barrenneſs was an image of his " juſtice and anger; whilſt the beauty of Gerizim re- " preſented his benediction and mercy. Benjamin de " Tudela confirms the teſtimony of the modern Jew, " and confutes the Greek poet, for he affirms, that " mount Ebal was a rock."

The eye-witneſs, of whom Baſnage here ſpeaks, is Jacobus Lævi Tomerita, whoſe teſtimony I have [i] juſt now tranſcribed from your diſſertation. Maundrell was likewiſe an eye-witneſs; and ſuch an one, that I cannot help preferring his authority to that of this modern Jew. And according to his account of theſe two moun-

[h] Hiſt. of Jews tranſlated by Taylor, B. vii. c. xxvi. ſ. iii.
[i] See pag. 92.

mountains; not as it is repreſented in your book, but as it ſtands in his own; Gerizim has not at preſent ſuch a *beautiful verdure*, as would make it a fit emblem of Gods benediction and mercy; nor could the poet, though he had confounded the two mountains, and had taken his deſcription of both from Gerizim, have ſaid, that they were

Ποιης τε πληθουσα και υλης ———

But let us hear what R. Benjamin ſays, "[k] who vi-"ſited Sichem about 600 years ago," and from whoſe itinerary you give us the following account. — "In "Neapoli, olim dicta Sichem, centum circiter Cu-"thæi, legis tantum Moſaicæ obſervatores, quos Sa-"maritanos appellant. Hi ſacerdotes habent ex Aa-"ronis proſapia — offerunt holocauſta in monte Ge-"rizim, et hanc eſſe domum ſanctuarii affirmant. "In hoc monte diverſi ſunt fontes ac pomaria; at "mons Ebal aridus eſt inſtar lapidum ac petrarum." — This account of the fertility of Gerizim riſes very little higher than Maundrells: it certainly does not come up to what the poet ſays both of this mountain and of Ebal. So that notwithſtanding the teſtimony of Jacobus Levi Tomerita, we may, I think, upon the authority of Maundrell venture to ſay, that both Gerizim and Ebal are barren mountains at preſent; but that Gerizim is ſomewhat the more fruitful or rather the leſs barren of the two: and we have no reaſon, from R. Benjamins account, to think that the ſtate of theſe two mountains 600 years ago, was very different from what it is now.

But do you think, that from the time of Joſhua to the preſent or to R. Benjamins time no changes have been made in the nature and face of the holy land? Maundrell was of a different opinion, and ſo muſt every man be, who believes, that Moſes gave a true deſcription of what this land was, when he wrote. [l]What Maundrell ſays upon this ſubject is worth attending to. — "All along this days travel from *Kane* "*Leban* to *Beer*, and alſo as far as we could ſee round, "the

[k] Diſſ. 2. pag. 37. [l] pag. 64. &c.

" the country diſcovered a quite different face from
" what it had before: preſenting nothing to the
" view, in moſt places but naked rocks, mountains,
" and precipices. At ſight of which, pilgrims are apt
" to be much aſtoniſhed and baulked in their expec-
" tations; finding that country in ſuch an inhoſpitable
" condition, concerning whoſe pleaſantneſs and plen-
" ty they had before formed in their minds ſuch high
" ideas from the deſcription given of it in the word
" of God: inſomuch that it almoſt ſtartles their faith,
" when they reflect, how it could be poſſible, for a
" land like this, to ſupply food for ſo prodigious a
" number of inhabitants, as are ſaid to have been
" polled in the twelve tribes at one time; the ſum
" given in by Joab, 2 Sam. xxiv, amounting to no
" leſs than thirteen hundred thouſand fighting men,
" beſides women and children. But it is certain, that
" any man, who is not a little biaſſed to infidelity be-
" fore, may ſee, as he paſſes along, arguments enough
" to ſupport his faith againſt ſuch ſcruples. For it is
" obvious for any one to obſerve, that theſe rocks and
" hills muſt *have been antiently covered with earth and*
" *cultivated* and made to contribute to the mainte-
" nance of the inhabitants, no leſs than if the country
" had been all plain, nay perhaps much more; foraſ-
" much as ſuch a mountainous and uneven ſurface af-
" fords a larger ſpace of ground for cultivation, than
" this country would amount to, if it were all reduced
" to a perfect level. For the huſbanding of theſe moun-
" tains, *their manner was* to gather up the ſtones and
" place them in ſeveral lines along the ſides of the
" hills in form of a wall. By ſuch borders they ſup-
" ported the mould from tumbling, or being waſh-
" ed down; and formed many beds of excellent ſoil,
" riſing gradually one above another from the bottom
" to the top of the mountains. Of this form of cul-
" ture you ſee evident foot ſteps, wherever you go in
" all the mountains of Paleſtine. Thus *the very rocks*
" *were made fruitful.* And perhaps there is no ſpot of

" ground in the whole land, that was not *formerly im-*
" *proved* to the production of ſomething or other,
" miniſtering to the ſuſtenance of human life. For
" than the plain countries nothing can be more fruit-
" ful, whether for the production of corn or cattle,
" and conſequently of milk. The hills, though im-
" proper for all cattle, except goats, yet being diſpoſed
" into ſuch beds as are afore deſcribed, *ſerved very*
" *well to* bear corn, melons, goards, cucumbers, and
" ſuch like garden ſtuff, which makes the principal
" food of theſe countries for ſeveral months in the
" year. The moſt rocky parts of all, which could
" not be adjuſted in that manner for the production
" of corn, might yet ſerve for the plantation of vines
" and olive-trees, which delight to extract, the one
" its fatneſs, the other its ſprightly juice, chiefly out
" of ſuch dry and flinty places."

If ſo great a change has been made in the mountainous and rocky parts of Paleſtine ſince the times of Joſhua; is not it probable, that the two mountains Gerizim and Ebal, as well as the other mountains of this country, may have formerly been very fruitful; though when Maundrell ſaw them, neither the one nor the other had ſuch a fertility, as could be boaſted of? About 600 years ago, when R. Benjamin ſaw them, Ebal was a rock, and all that he could ſay for Gerizim was, that there were upon it — *diverſi fontes ac pomaria.* — However high you may rate this difference; you have certainly no reaſon for ſaying, that when Gerizim in the time of Joſhua was in its beſt condition, Ebal was not equal to it in fertility: on the contrary we have the teſtimony of Theodotus, who lived, though long after the time of Joſhua, yet many centuries before R. Benjamin, to prove, that, when he wrote, both mountains were

Ποιης τε πληθουσα και υλης ———

And now having produced the teſtimony of Theodotus, of which you have ſaid nothing, and the teſtimony of Maundrell, which is widely different from what

what you have repreſented it to be; I will give you your option, whether you will ſuppoſe the condition of Gerizim and Ebal to have been the ſame in the times of Joſhua, that it was, when Maundrell ſaw them, or the ſame, that it was, when Theodotus wrote. When Maundrell ſaw them, though Ebal was ſcorched and unfruitful, yet Gerizim had not ſuch a *beautiful verdure*, as would determine it to be the mount of the altar. And when Theodotus wrote, though Gerizim was then a verdant and fruitful mountain, yet ſtill the place of the altar cannot be determined by this circumſtance; becauſe Ebal was then equal to it in verdure and fruitfulneſs.

[a] You have ſtill one argument in reſerve, which is drawn from the circumſtances of the ſacred hiſtory and ſeems to you to be deciſive. As you lay ſo much ſtreſs upon it; I ſhall examine it the more particularly, that the reader may ſee, how much *ſtronger* it is than Mr. Whiſtons. "A day of great ſolemnity, you ſay, is "appointed — the twelve tribes are ſtationed, and "every circumſtance is performed, agreeably to the "divine commands — Six tribes therefore are ſtation-"ed upon Gerizim, and ſix upon Ebal; probably "*the princes* (the repreſentatives of each tribe,) upon "the top or on the ſide; and the common people "(regulated by their captains and other officers) ex-"tended over the plain, from the foot of each moun-"tain: and in the valley between the two mountains, "is the ark of God; attended by a ſelect number of "the Levites — the tribes being *properly* ſtationed, *an* "*altar* is built, either in Gerizim or Ebal, and upon "this altar are offered *burnt-offerings* and *peace-offer-*"*ings*; the former to atone for their ſins, and the "latter to expreſs their gratitude for their preſent "peace, and their ſupplication for its continuance— "the ſacrifices being offered, a copy of the law is en-"graved upon ſtones, placed upon the mountains— "and the law, thus engraved, being read; *bleſſings* "are

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 73.

" are then pronounced from mount Gerizim and " curſings from mount Ebal." From the inaccuracy of this introduction we may judge what we are to expect in the argument which is to follow it. I take it for granted, that when you ſay — " The tribes being " *properly* ſtationed" — you mean, that their ſtations were what you have thought *proper* to give them, and had juſt been deſcribing, that half of the princes were on one of the mountains and half of them on the other, and that the people regulated by their captains and other officers were below on the plain. Now there is one circumſtance in the [b] command given by Moſes to the Iſraelites, which I would deſire the reader to attend to. — " Thou ſhalt offer, ſays Moſes, *peace-offerings* and *ſhalt eat there* [in the mount of the altar] and rejoice before the Lord thy God." — The reader may obſerve here, that God by Moſes commanded all the Iſraelites to feaſt and rejoice on the mount of the altar; but that you, by ſtationing them in the valley, before the altar was built, and by keeping them there during the time of the ſacrifices, and till the bleſſings and curſes had been pronounced, have excluded them from this mount, whichever of the two it was, and from the feaſtings and rejoicings, which were celebrated upon it. You have indeed uſed the people as well, as you have that half of the princes, which you have ſtationed on the oppoſite mountain: for theſe according to your account, like the body of the people in the valley, were to ſtand there and to look on, whilſt the other half of them were feaſting. Poſſibly you deſigned to accommodate your uſage of the princes to what you ſuppoſed to be the nature of the mountain, on which you reſpectively placed them. You provided a feaſt for thoſe, whom you ſtationed on Gerizim, which you imagine to have been the mount of the altar, and in its own nature a beautiful and fertile place; in the mean time you took care, that they, who ſtood on the barren mountain Ebal, ſhould have

[b] Deut. xxvii. 7.

have nothing to eat. However, you have aſſigned ſo much work to the princes on Gerizim, that if this is taken into the account, you will be found upon the whole to have made a more equal diſtribution of things, than one would think at firſt ſight. For let us conſider a little, what was the number of theſe princes, whom you ſtation upon the tops or on the ſides of the two mountains, to repreſent the tribes, whilſt the common people were in the valley below. You cannot by the princes mean the elders or officers or judges of Iſrael; becauſe we learn from the book of [c] Joſhua, that theſe ſtood with the reſt of the Iſraelites: and accordingly, as you thought proper to ſtation the common people in the valley, ſo you have ſtationed theſe there under the titles of captains and other officers. It is the more neceſſary to take notice of this; becauſe though here, at page 73, you mention only *the princes* as the repreſentatives of each tribe, yet elſewhere, at page 81, you add I know not what *chief men* to *the princes:* for thus you write — "Now, upon Gerizim were ſtation-"ed the princes and chief men, as repreſentatives of "ſix of the tribes, of which Levi was one; and on "Ebal were ſtationed the other ſix tribes, as repre-"ſented alſo by their chief men and princes." But read the paſſage of the book of Joſhua juſt now referred to — "Then Joſhua built an altar unto the Lord in mount [Ebal]—and they offered burnt-offerings and ſacrificed peace-offerings, and he wrote there upon the ſtones a copy of the law of Moſes, which he wrote in the preſence of the children of Iſrael. And *all Iſrael and their elders, and officers, and their judges, ſtood on this ſide the ark, and on that ſide* before the prieſts the Levites, which bare the ark — as well the ſtranger as he that was born among them; half of them over againſt mount Gerizim, and half of them over againſt mount Ebal." — You might have ſeen in this account that the elders, the officers and judges ſtood where the common people ſtood, wherever that was: and therefore, as

[c] Joſh. viii. 30—33.

as you have ſtationed the common people in the plain, you have no *chief men* left to join to *the princes* as repreſentatives of the tribes. But Moſes informs us, that [g] the princes of Iſrael were only twelve men. And to half of them, that is, to ſix men, you have aſſigned the labour of building the altar, of offering the ſacrifices, and of engraving the law upon the ſtones, which were placed in the mountain, where this half of them ſtood: and as you ſuppoſe them to have ſtood on mount Gerizim, they were likewiſe to pronounce the ſolemn bleſſings from thence. All this work was to be done by them in one days time, as you inform us, at page 94, where you place their work in the ſame order, in which you have placed it here. — "The Iſra-" elites, you ſay, enter Canaan in conſequence of the " covenant with God — they no ſooner enjoy peace in " that land, but they ſet apart *one day* for prayer, " thankſgiving and devout remembrance of that co-" venant—they firſt erect an altar, and offer ſacrifices " — they then engrave the ten commandments upon " two great ſtones — when thus engraved, they plaiſter " the ſtones with plaiſter, and erect them on ſome " conſpicuous point of mount Gerizim — from them, " thus erected Joſhua proclaims the ten command-" ments to the people," and then the whole is cloſed with the ſolemn bleſſings and curſings. Truly for ſuch *a days* work they deſerved to be diſtinguiſhed, not only from the common people, but likewiſe from the other ſix princes, by the feaſt, which your account appropriates to them: the only doubt is, whether you have not found ſo much work for them, as not to allow them time to eat it. You will ſcarce ſay, that as in the book of Joſhua no mention is made of any rejoicings of all the congregation upon the mount of the altar, we have no reaſon to think, that there were any. For in the firſt place as we find, that the command, given by Moſes to the whole congregation is—"Thou ſhalt eat there [upon the mount where the altar was to

[g] Numb. i. 5—16. 44.

to be built] and rejoice before the Lord thy God,"—both in the Hebrew and in the Samaritan copy; you might have been ſure, that Joſhua would no more neglect this command, than he did the others, which related to the other parts of this tranſaction: we muſt therefore interpret what is told in fewer words in the book of Joſhua, by what is commanded in more words in the book of Deuteronomy; even if in the former there had been no evidence at all of any feaſtings and rejoicings being celebrated upon this occaſion. But ſecondly the hiſtory of the fact expreſsly ſays, that peace-offerings were offered: and from the viith chapter of Leviticus it appears, that peace-offerings were feaſted on by thoſe, on whoſe behalf they were offered.

I have one more obſervation to make on this introduction to your deciſive argument. Moſes in reckoning up the twelve princes in the book of [e] Numbers, does not conſider the whole houſe of Joſeph as only one tribe, but makes Ephraim and Manaſſeh two diſtinct tribes. There were therefore in this account twelve tribes, and twelve princes without Levi. The princes, who were to ſtand with Moſes and Aaron, whilſt they took the ſum of the people, and the tribes, which they belonged to, are thus enumerated—of the tribe of Reuben, Elizur;—of Simeon, Shelumiel;—of Judah, Nahſhon;—of Iſſachar, Nethaneel;—of Zebulun, Eliab;—of the children of Joſeph, of Ephraim, Eliſhama;—of Manaſſeh, Gamaliel;—of Benjamin, Abidan;—of Dan, Ahiezer;—of Aſher, Pagiel;—of Gad, Eliaſaph;—of Naphtali, Ahira.—Thus there was no prince for the tribe of Levi at this time. And indeed the diviſion of the tribes relative to their having princes is ſuch, as would exclude Levi for the time to come. Accordingly we find in the book of Joſhua, xxii. 13, when the reſt of the children of Iſrael heard, that the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manaſſeh had builded

[e] Compare Numb. i. 5—16. 44. viii. 1—83. with Deut. xxvii. 12. 13.

builded an altar on the borders of Jordan, they ſent a meſſage to them " by Phinehas, the ſon of Eleazer the prieſt, and with him *ten* princes of each chief houſe a prince." If to theſe *ten* princes you add one for Reuben and one for Gad, theſe will make the whole number twelve without reckoning Levi. No prince is to be added for the half tribe of Manaſſeh, which was with the Reubenites and the Gadites: becauſe in this reckoning there would have been two princes in this tribe, one for this half, and another for the other half, and conſequently thirteen in all without Levi. But it is remarkable that in the book of Deuteronomy, where the ſtations of the tribes during the ſolemnity of pronouncing the bleſſings and the curſes are deſcribed, a different diviſion of the tribes is uſed: for the two families of the houſe of Joſeph are here conſidered only as one tribe; and Levi is reckoned amongſt the other tribes to make up the number twelve. Simeon, *Levi*, Judah, Iſſachar, *Joſeph*, and Benjamin were to be ſtationed on Gerizim; and Reuben, Gad, Aſher, Zebulun, Dan and Naphtali on Ebal. After you have weighed this matter well; you may aſk yourſelf where your accuracy was, when you wrote thus—" ſix tribes are ſtationed upon Gerizim, and ſix " upon Ebal; probably *the princes*, the repreſentatives " of each tribe, upon the top or on the ſide, and the " common people—extended over the plain, from the " foot of each mountain?" Is it *probable*, that ſix tribes, as thus deſcribed, ſhould be ſtationed in each mountain reſpectively by *the princes* their repreſentatives, whilſt the common people were in the plain below; when we find, that, though there were two *princes* in the family of Joſeph, one for Ephraim and another for Manaſſeh, yet theſe two tribes are here conſidered as only one; nay when we find, that Levi was ſtationed on Gerizim, notwithſtanding Levi had no prince?

Calmet in his dictionary, under the article *Ebal* is guilty of the ſame miſtake.—I have not been able to meet with the original; but the Engliſh tranſlation ſays; " As to the ceremony of conſecrating the common-

" wealth of the Hebrews, it is thought to have been " performed in this manner. The heads [that is, as " they are afterwards called, *the princes*] of the ſix firſt " tribes went up to the top of mount Gerizim, and the " heads of the other ſix tribes to the top of mount " Ebal. The prieſts with the ark, and Joſhua at the " head of the elders of Iſrael, took their ſtation in " the middle of the valley, which lies between the " two mountains. The Levites ranged themſelves in " a circle about the ark; and the elders with the " people placed themſelves at the foot of each moun- " tain ſix tribes on a ſide." Calmet indeed has placed Joſhua in the valley; whereas you place him upon mount Gerizim. In all other reſpects your arrangement of the princes and the tribes is ſo like his, that the reader will probably think, that one was copied from the other. But if you did copy from him, yet as you have not thought proper to mention his name, you have made yourſelf anſwerable for his inaccuracies as well as for your own.

If you did not borrow your account from him, your reaſon for ſuppoſing the common people to have been ſtationed in the plain, and the tribes to have ſtood on the two mountains by their repreſentatives *the princes*, might poſſibly be, what we read in the paſſage of the book of Joſhua quoted [f] above, that " all Iſrael with their elders and officers and judges ſtood — half of them over againſt mount Gerizim, and half of them over againſt mount Ebal;" for where our tranſlation ſays—*over againſt*—you, at page 81, add—or *from the foot of*,—as if you thought, that אל מול might as well be tranſlated one way as the other. But whichever of theſe tranſlations you may chuſe to abide by, I have ſhewn you, that either your own imagination or Calmets dictionary has led you into great miſtakes.

I do not know, whether I can explain this deſcription of the ſtation of the *twelve tribes*, which we meet with in the book of Joſhua, any better than you have done: it is

[f] See pag. 101.

is ſufficient for me, if I have ſhewn, that your explanation of it is inaccurate. However, I will hazard a conjecture, without changing our preſent verſion. Moſes, in his command, deſigned to deſcribe the places, on which the people were to ſtand; whilſt the bleſſings and the curſes were declaring, when he writes — "[g] Theſe ſhall ſtand [עַל הַר] upon mount Gerizim to bleſs the people; — Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Iſſachar, and Joſeph, and Benjamin. And theſe ſhall ſtand [בְּהַר] upon mount Ebal to curſe; Reuben, Gad, and Aſher, and Zebulun, Dan and Naphtali."—But perhaps, in the account of what Joſhua did in obedience to the command of Moſes, regard may be had, not to the place, on which theſe two diviſions, each conſiſting of ſix tribes, ſtood, but to the place, towards which the faces of the people in each diviſion were turned during the ſolemnity of pronouncing the bleſſings and the curſings; when the ſacred hiſtorian writes, thus—"all Iſrael ſtood on this ſide and on that ſide before the prieſts the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord—half of them over againſt mount Gerizim and half of them over againſt mount Ebal." —So that thoſe ſix tribes, which in the book of Deuteronomy are commanded to ſtand upon Gerizim, are the ſame, which in the book of Joſhua are ſaid to have ſtood over againſt Ebal; and the other ſix, which Moſes commanded to ſtand upon Ebal, are the ſame, which Joſhua is ſaid to have ſtationed over againſt Gerizim. — If this be true, it may help to confirm what I have ſaid above [h] of ſolemn bleſſings and curſings in general; that if they related to any place at all, it was not the place, on which the perſon ſtood, who pronounced them, but the place, towards which he turned his face. And accordingly, though Moſes has only deſcribed the places where the ſix tribes, which pronounced the bleſſings, ſhould ſtand, and the place, where the other ſix ſhould ſtand, which pronounced

[g] Deut. xxvii. 12. 13. [h] See pag. 25. 26. 27.

ced the curſes; yet in the book of Joſhua the reaſon of their being thus ſtationed is ſuggeſted: the latter were to ſtand on Ebal, that they might look towards Gerizim; and the former were to ſtand on Gerizim, that they might look towards Ebal. Thus far I agree with you, that the prieſts the levites, who are mentioned here as bearing the ark, were a ſelect body of them; and that theſe with the ark ſtood in the valley between the two mountains. But I muſt deſire you to remember, that I do not deſign to exclude either theſe levites, or the ſix tribes, which I have ſtationed on the mountain oppoſite to that, where the altar was, from the feaſting and rejoicings, which were celebrated on the latter: for I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew you preſently, that whilſt the Iſraelites were feaſting and rejoicing, all the tribes and theſe levites amongſt the reſt were on the mount of the altar; and conſequently, that the ſtations, which I have been deſcribing, are thoſe only, in which they were placed, whilſt the law was read and the bleſſings and curſings declared.

Having gotten through this promiſing introduction, you begin your *deciſive argument* with aſking, at pag. 74, "Where can we ſuppoſe Joſhua, the "captain-general, to have been ſtationed during this "ſolemn tranſaction?" Before I anſwer this queſtion, give me leave to aſk another — What part of this tranſaction does your enquiry relate to? If to the beginning of it, whilſt the ſacrifices were offering, and the people were feaſting and rejoicing; we know, that he was then upon the mount of the altar: for all Iſrael were there at that time; according to this command of Moſes, part of which I have quoted already; — "[i] Ye ſhall ſet up theſe ſtones, which I command you this day in mount [Ebal according to one copy, Gerizim according to the other] — and there ſhalt thou build an altar unto the Lord thy God — and thou ſhalt offer burnt-offerings thereon unto the Lord thy God; and thou ſhalt ſacrifice peace-offerings, and ſhalt

[i] Deut. xxvii. 4—8.

ſhalt eat there and rejoice before the Lord thy God. And thou ſhalt write upon the ſtones all the words of this law." — If your enquiry relates to the latter part of this tranſaction, when the bleſſings and curſings were pronounced; I anſwer, that then he was ſtationed upon mount Gerizim, agreeably to what you ſay, that "he was of the tribe of Ephraim; that Ephraim "was the ſon of Joſeph, and that the deſcendants of "Joſeph were certainly ſtationed upon Gerizim." I ſhall have occaſion to make a more particular application of this diſtinction between the different places, where Joſhua and the reſt of the family of Joſeph ſtood in the former and in the latter part of this tranſaction, when we *advance one ſtep farther* in your argument and *arrive at your demonſtration*. At preſent it is enough juſt to have mentioned it.——You go on to aſk — "Shall we ſuppoſe him [Joſhua] to have "ſtood on the beautiful mountain of *bleſſings*, or "upon that of curſings; on the mountain honoured "with *the altar* and *the law*, or the contrary?" Maundrell has taught us, [k] that as to beauty or fertility this mountain has not much to boaſt of: and we have likewiſe ſeen, that [l] the bleſſings pronounced from it neither implied that there was previouſly any peculiar ſanctity in it, nor communicated any to it. —— You aſk farther in ſumming up this part of your argument —— "Shall we refuſe to allow, that the altar "and the law were placed on the mount of bleſſing— "on the ſame mount with Joſhua, the heroic leader "of the people — on the ſame mount with their "glory, the tribe of Judah," which, as you had before told us, was "the tribe of the Meſſiah?" Thus the whole amount of what you have to urge in favour of Gerizim from its being the mount, on which Joſhua and likewiſe the tribe of Judah were ſtationed, whilſt the bleſſings and curſings were proclaimed, amounts to this;—You think, that to ſuch a leader and to ſuch a tribe

[k] See at page 92 of this letter.

[l] See page 25. &c.

tribe the greateſt honour would be paid, and that it was the greateſt honour to be placed on the mount of the law and of the altar: but they were placed upon Gerizim; and from hence you conclude, that *the law* and *the altar* were there too. Now ſuppoſe, that in reply to one of the principles, upon which your concluſion depends, I ſhould ſay, that, wherever the altar and the law might be, the greateſt honour conſiſted, not in ſtanding upon the ſame mountain with them, but in being appointed to the auſpicious office of proclaiming Gods bleſſings to the people, which could not fail of recommending thoſe, who were to diſcharge it, to the favour and eſteem of their hearers; and that conſequently, though the altar and the law were on Ebal, yet the tribes, which were ſtationed with it, had leſs honour done them, than Judah and Joſhua with the family of Joſeph and the reſt, which were ſtationed on the oppoſite mountain; becauſe the office of bleſſing the people was aſſigned to the latter, whilſt the former were appointed to the hateful office of curſing them. Suppoſe I ſhould add, that we have no reaſon to think, there was any peculiar honour in being ſtationed upon the ſame mount with the law and the altar; becauſe whichever of the two this was, all the tribes were certainly upon it, whilſt they were eating and rejoicing before the Lord. Such a reply as this would make it very difficult for you and me to ſettle, what was in this caſe the true notion of honour and what the proper manner of doing honour. And if we were to call in a third perſon; he would probably tell us, that it was not worth our while to give either ourſelves or him any trouble about the matter; till we had ſhewn, that the other principle, from which you argue, is true. For it does not appear from the hiſtory of the tranſaction, or from the command of Moſes, that God deſigned to do more honour to one half of the congregation, than he did to the other. Certainly he did not deſign to do any particular honour to Judah or to Levi or to Joſeph the tribe of Joſhua: becauſe though in your book

book the ſix tribes ſtationed on mount Gerizim are placed in this order—Judah, Levi, Joſeph, Simeon, Iſſachar, and Benjamin; yet in the command of God by Moſes, Deut. xxvii. 12, they are ranked thus—Simeon, Levi, Judah, Iſſachar, Joſeph, Benjamin. We learn from the firſt book of Chronicles, v. 1. 2, that "the birth-right was given unto the ſons of Joſeph; but that the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birth-right; for Judah prevailed amongſt his brethren" for the very reaſon, which you mention, "becauſe of him *came* [as our tranſlators ſay, when they might better have ſaid, of him *ſhall be*] the chief ruler;" that is, according to the opinion of ſome of the beſt interpreters, the Meſſiah. But as the birth-right of Joſeph, conſiſting in a double portion of the temporal inheritance, gave his family no precedence in other caſes; ſo neither did the heroic leader Joſhua, who was of this family, obtain any precedence for it in the preſent caſe. Nay, though the ſacred writer of the firſt book of Chronicles begins the genealogy from Judah, becauſe he prevailed amongſt his brethren and the chief ruler was to ariſe from his tribe; yet when Moſes enumerates the ſix tribes, which were to be ſtationed on Gerizim, he ſhews us by the order, in which he places them, that upon this occaſion no regard was paid to this conſideration.

[m] Philalethes might for any thing, that I know, have other reaſons beſides theſe, but, if he had only theſe, they would be ſufficient, to juſtify what he ſays that "as to Judah" [and he might have added,—as to Joſhua] "there is no ſolidity in the argument."

But "now, you ſay, page 75, as to the true place "*of the altar* and *the law*; if we advance one ſtep "farther, we ſhall ſeem to arrive at demonſtration. "If *the altar* was upon Ebal, doubtleſs, the ſacrifices "were offered upon Ebal. But, who then were the "ſacrificers? Did Reuben, or Gad, or Aſher, did "Zebulun, or Dan, or Naphtali, impiouſly furniſh "out men for prieſts, on this very ſolemn occaſion?

[m] Library N°. iv. pag. 209.

Moſt

" Moſt certainly not. And yet theſe were the ſix " tribes expreſly ſtationed upon Ebal. You then " obſerve, that Levi, the tribe of the *prieſts, the only* " *men who were to miniſter before God in ſacrifice* were " expreſly ſtationed upon Gerizim; and conclude " with aſking, whether we ſhall refuſe to allow, that " the altar and the law were placed on the mount of " bleſſings — on the ſame mount with *the tribe of* " *Levi* who were *the proper, the divinely appointed,* " *the only, miniſters at that very altar?*" Philalethes, in the place juſt now referred to, takes notice, that though " the tribe of Levi was ſtationed on Gerizim " [whilſt the bleſſings and curſings were pronounced] " yet this tribe might ſtill attend the oblations on " Ebal, which do not appear to have been preſcribed " to be made during that ſervice." [n] The command of Moſes might have ſhewn you, that the ſacrifices, not only do not appear to have been, but moſt certainly were not offered during the time of pronouncing the bleſſings and the curſings: for during this latter part of the ſolemnity, ſix of the tribes ſtood on Gerizim and ſix on Ebal; whereas in the former part, whilſt the ſacrifices were offering, all the congregation were in the mount of the altar, whichever of the two this was. If you had attended to this difference in the ſituation of the Iſraelites, it would have ſhewn you, that theſe two parts of the ſolemnity muſt have been performed at different times, and that between the times of performing theſe two parts, ſix of the tribes muſt have gone from the mount of the altar to the oppoſite mount. Your argument therefore, when it is ſtated as it ſhould be to make it agree with the command of Moſes, will ſtand thus — Levi, whilſt the ſacrifices were offering, muſt neceſſarily have been upon the mount *of the altar*; becauſe of this tribe were *the proper, the divinely-appointed, the only, miniſters at that altar.* But whilſt the bleſſings and the curſings were pronouncing Levi was expreſly ſtationed upon Gerizim.—The difference

[n] Deut. xxvii. 4—13. See above at pag. 107.

between

between the time of performing the former part of this ſolemnity and the time of performing the latter part of it, when joined to the undoubted evidence, which we have, that ſix of the tribes had in the mean while changed their place, will not ſuffer you to conclude from hence, that Gerizim was the mount of the altar; till you have proved, what the ſacred writings afford you no grounds for ſaying, that Levi was not one of theſe ſix tribes. If you do not yet underſtand, that what *ſeemed to you* to be *demonſtration*, wants a neceſſary ſtep; perhaps I may be able to ſhew you this more plainly by applying an argument formed upon the ſame principles to prove, that *the altar* ſtood upon Ebal. As you prove, that Levi was upon the mount of the altar, becauſe this was the tribe of the *prieſts, the only men, who were to miniſter before God in ſacrifice*; ſo I prove, that any other tribe, Reuben for inſtance, was upon the mount of the altar; becauſe all Iſrael, the tribe of Reuben amongſt the reſt, were by the divine command to eat *there* and to rejoice before the Lord. But Reuben was one of the tribes, which were expreſly ſtationed upon Ebal. Therefore Ebal was the mount of the altar. It muſt be a ſingular kind of argument, which in your hands will demonſtrate, that this altar was upon Gerizim, and in mine, that it was upon Ebal. The truth is, that it proves nothing at all, either in your hands or in mine: becauſe between the time of ſacrificing, feaſting, and rejoicing, and the time when Levi was expreſly ſtationed on Gerizim, and Reuben expreſly ſtationed on Ebal, ſix of the tribes had certainly gone from one mountain to the other; and neither of us have ſhewn, which thoſe ſix tribes were.

I know of no way, by which either of us can ſhew, which they were, beſides this—If you can prove, that Gerizim was the mount of the altar, it will follow from hence, that Reuben, Gad, Aſher, Zebulun, Dan and Naphtali, who were on the mount of the altar with the reſt of the Iſraelites during the ſacrifices and feaſtings, were

were the tribes, which went to the oppoſite mountain, before the time of pronouncing the bleſſings and the curſings: for at this time we find theſe ſix tribes ſtationed on Ebal. On the contrary, if I can prove, that Ebal was the mount of the altar; the conſequence will be, that the ſix tribes, which changed place, were Simeon, Levi, Judah, Iſſachar, Joſeph, and Benjamin: for theſe according to the command of God given by Moſes muſt have been upon this mount, whilſt the ſacrifices were offering, and the people were feaſting; and Levi in particular muſt have been there; becauſe the ſacrifices could not be offered by any perſons except the prieſts, who were all of this tribe: and yet at the time of bleſſing and curſing the people, we find theſe ſix tribes expreſly ſtationed on Gerizim. Thus neither you nor I can conclude any thing from this argument in favour of our reſpective opinions, till we have added to it the ſtep, which was wanting, by determining, whether Gerizim or Ebal was the mount of the altar; that is, this argument cannot be made uſe of in this queſtion, either on one ſide or on the other, till the queſtion is determined.

It may perhaps be expected of me to inform my readers, that though you have ſtated ſeparately your two arguments, or your two parts of the ſame argument; one of which is drawn from the honourable regard, which you ſuppoſe to have been had in this tranſaction to Joſhua and to Judah; and the other from the neceſſity there was for the tribe of Levi, that is, for the prieſts to have been where the altar was; yet in your general concluſion you have joined them both together, and urge them in the following manner — "Shall we then refuſe to allow, that *the altar* "and *the law*, were placed on the mount of *bleſſings* —"on the ſame mount with Joſhua, the heroic leader "of the people—on the ſame mount with their glory, "the tribe of Judah—and on the ſame mount with "the tribe of *Levi*, who were *the proper*, *the divinely ap-* "*pointed*, *the only*, *miniſters at that very altar?*" But I

have ſhewn, that one of theſe arguments has nothing to ſupport it, beſides a conceit, that God deſigned to do particular honour to Joſhua and to Judah, and a fanciful notion about the manner of doing it; and that the other ſeemed to you to be demonſtration, only becauſe you did not attend to the command of God, that all Iſrael ſhould be in the mount of the altar, whilſt the ſacrifices were offering, and confounded the different times, in which the different parts of this ſolemn tranſaction were performed. But a chimæra and a blunder, when they are joined together, have no more weight in proving any thing, than they have, when they are applied ſeparately.

Since Joſhua, who was ſtationed with the family of Joſeph on Gerizim, [n] read the law to the people, and ſince the law was engraved on the ſtones, which were ſet up in the mount of the altar; ſome of your readers may poſſibly imagine, that he read the law from theſe ſtones, and conſequently that they and the altar were on mount Gerizim. If they ſhould think, that you deſigned to lead them to this concluſion by ſaying in one place — "[o] The law thus engraved being read" — and in another — "We may fairly preſume, that "the law, which was then read, was the ſame with "the law then engraved;" — they need only turn to ſome other paſſages in your book, to one, where you "[p] preſume, that the curſes" [denounced on this ſolemn occaſion] "*were not* what Moſes commanded to "be engraved, and conſequently *were not* what Joſhua "did engrave" — and [q] to another, where you endeavour to prove at large, that the law then engraved was only the ten commandments. For, when they find in the book of Joſhua, that "[r] he read all the words of the law, the bleſſings and curſings, according to all that is written in the book of the law; there was not a word of all that Moſes commanded, which Joſhua read not before all the congregation of Iſrael," — they will

[n] Joſh. viii. 34. 35. [o] Diff. 2. pag. 74. 88. [p] Diff. 2. pag. 87. [q] Diff. 2. pag. 88—100. [r] Joſh. viii. 34. 35.

will ſee, that the bleſſings and curſings were read by Joſhua, as well as the law; and that the law, which was read, was not the ten commandments only, but the whole law of Moſes. But, if the bleſſings and curſings were read by Joſhua, and yet, as you preſume, were not engraved upon the ſtones; if the whole law of Moſes was read, and yet nothing was engraved upon the ſtones, beſides the ten commandments; the conſequence is, that he read from ſomething elſe, and not from the ſtones: ſo that his reading the law is no evidence, that he was then upon the ſame mountain, on which theſe ſtones were erected. When [s] Joſhua in his old age gathered all the Iſraelites together at Shechem, he had the book of the law of God with him: for after making a covenant with them to ſerve and obey the Lord, he wrote the words of this covenant in it, and then ſet up a ſtone for a witneſs under an oak, which was by the ſanctuary of the Lord. And doubtleſs he had the ſame book with him, at the other ſolemn aſſembly, which we have juſt now been ſpeaking of.

I cannot leave this ſubject without taking notice of a compariſon, which you make between the book of Joſhua, as it now ſtands, and ſome Samaritan chronicon or other, which you had in your mind. "[t] The "evidences ariſing from the text itſelf, Deut. xxvii. 4, "are, you ſay, equal." Your reaſon for ſaying this, I preſume is, becauſe the Hebrew copy, on the one hand, reads Ebal; and the Samaritan copy, on the other hand, reads Gerizim. "But you add, that there "is another expreſs text, which muſt be here conſi-"dered — If then the original command" [by means of the oppoſite evidences of the two copies of the pentateuch] "be in this caſe become indeterminate; let "us ſee, ſay you, how the fact itſelf is related: "though from the text of Joſhua alſo, as it now "ſtands, the Samaritans have very little to hope for. "The Engliſh verſion informs us, from the preſent He-

[s] Joſh. xxiv. 25. 26. [t] Diſſ. 2. pag. 72. 27.

" Hebrew text of Joſh. viii. 30, that *Joſhua built the* " *altar in mount Ebal.* But here alſo we muſt note, " that the Samar. chronicon (which begins with the " hiſtory of Joſhua in 39 chapters) affirms, that " Joſhua built this altar on Gerizim. Wherefore as " the authorities of theſe two parties are again con- " tradictory; we muſt now attend to the circum- " ſtances of the ſacred hiſtory; and theſe you think " to be deciſive." How deciſive they are, we have juſt now ſeen. My deſign, in detaining the reader a few minutes longer in the enquiry about Gerizim and Ebal, is to give him a view of the two evidences, which you compare together.

What would you have your readers underſtand, when you ſay, that " the authorities of the two par- " ties are again contradictory?" Do you only mean, that the evidence of the book of Joſhua, as it ſtands in the Hebrew bible, which ſays, that [u] the altar was built on Ebal; and the evidence of a Samaritan chronicle, which ſays, that it was built on Gerizim, are contrary to one another? If this is the whole of your meaning, your obſervation is very little to the purpoſe; unleſs you can ſhew, that as much credit is due to this Samaritan chronicle, as to the Hebrew text of the book of Joſhua: becauſe where two parties give contrary evidence about the ſame fact; if one of them is of no credit, the teſtimony of the other is to be believed; unleſs this other can be ſhewn to be likewiſe of no credit. Would you therefore have us underſtand, not that the two evidences in the preſent caſe are merely contrary to one another, but that no more credit is due to the one, than to the other? If this is your meaning, you had better have been contented with intimating, that the Jews have corrupted Joſhua as well as Deuteronomy; as you had done juſt before, when you ſaid, that " from the text " of Joſhua, as it now ſtands, the Samaritans have " very little to hope for;" than have gone on to introduce this compariſon.

Reland,

[u] Joſh. viii. 30.

[x] Reland, in his diſſertation on the Samaritans, ſays of one of their chronicles — "Quid illud eſt, quod, "cap. 43, lego de Samuele propheta? — *Fuit autem* "*Samuel ortus ex tribu Aaronis, Levita, Magus, et* "*vir infidelis*, — horreſco referens. Scilicet ab eo "tempore, quo a Judæis ſeceſſerunt Samaritani, et "populus quidam hoc nomine a Judæis diverſus eſſe "cœpit, ſolam legem Moſis, ſive pentateuchum pro "verbo Dei habentes, ignominioſe traducere reliquos "prophetas, qui aliquo in honore erant penes Judæos, "e re ſua eſſe crediderunt." — And according to his account their want of accuracy in their hiſtory of Joſhua is as notorious, as their want of honeſty in the character, which they give of Samuel. — "[y] Vix "quidpiam in chronico noſtro fuſius traditur, quam "bellum Joſuæ cum rege Perſiæ Schaubeco, quod "undecim capitibus enarratur — Totam vero illam "hiſtoriam Schaubeci confictam eſſe ſatis apparet, ut "alia taceam, ex ipſius genealogia collata cum ra-"tione temporum. Ait Schaubec, cap. 37, *Ego ſum* "*Schaubec*, filius Hemam, filii Phut, filii Cham, filii "Noachi, cui Deus benedixit, quum ex arca egrede-"retur."——Reland then goes on to obſerve, that though there are thus ſuppoſed to be only *three intermediate perſons* between Noah and Schaubec, and the Scriptures teach us, that there are *twenty-three* between Noah and Joſhua; yet this chronicle makes Joſhua and Schaubec contemporaries. And upon the whole he concludes — "Si vel ad hoc unum attenderant Samaritani, "ſatis conſpicerent fabuloſum eſſe hoc chronicon ſuum "nec fidem mereri."——Does it appear as plainly upon the face of the book of Joſhua, viii. 30, in the Hebrew bible, where the mount of the altar is ſpoken of, that the Jews have corrupted this paſſage by changing Gerizim into Ebal, as it appears upon the face of this chronicle, that it is full of falſehood? If it does; you might at once have determined the queſtion,— which

[x] Diſſert. Miſcell. Par. alter. pag. 87.

[y] Ibid. pag. 83.

which of theſe two was the mount of the altar? — without giving yourſelf ſo much trouble; or rather there never could have been any ſuch queſtion at all: if it does not; then the teſtimony of the book of Joſhua and the teſtimony of the Samaritan chronicle about this matter, though they are contradictory, do not deſtroy one another.

But you have a note here, which muſt not be paſſed over. Whilſt you are ſpeaking in the text of your book about a Samaritan chronicle, you refer your readers to the bottom of the page: and there I find this farther reference, "[z] See Acta eruditorum Lips. "1691, pag.167. and alſo Relands Diſſert. on the "Samaritans and their chronicon, Sect. 27. 33. *This* "chronicon, of the Samaritans (in the Samar. cha-"racter, but the Arabic language) has not yet been "publiſhed."—I cannot pretend to be ſure, that you thought the chronicle in the *Leipſic acts* to be an extract from that, which Reland mentions: but as you were ſpeaking, in your text, of "the Samaritan chronicon, "which begins with the hiſtory of Joſhua in 39 "chapters," that is, as you were ſpeaking of only one chronicon, and then, after referring your readers, to the *Leipſic acts* and to Reland, go on to ſay — "*This* chronicon, &c;" that is, go on ſtill to ſpeak of only one; there is good reaſon to believe, that you did think ſo. If you did, you might have been better informed by [a] Reland, who writes thus — "Juvat et chronolo-"gica quædam ex chronico noſtro excerpere, et eo "quidem magis, quod illa abeant in nonnullis ab ra-"tione temporum, quam habet Abulfetach recens "ſcriptor chronici Samaritici, quod ab antiquo illo "eſt diverſiſſimum.——Ceterum qui chronologiam "Samaritanorum ab Abulfetacho in compendium re-"dactam legere vult, adeat *Acta eruditorum Lipſiens.* "Tom. x. an.1691. pag. 167---173." If you had attended to this obſervation made by Reland, you would

[z] Diſſ. 2. pag. 72. Note. [a] Diſſ. Miſcell. Par. alter. pag. 89. &c.

would have found, that there are two Samaritan chronicles, whoſe authority you might have oppoſed to the book of Joſhua, as it ſtands at preſent.

But be this as it will. The remainder of your note is curious — This chronicon of the Samaritans "is "allowed, you ſay, to be (in compariſon of their "pentateuch) a late work and of little authority: "and it is referred to, becauſe the Samaritans have "no other hiſtory, which mentions this tranſaction of "Joſhua." Whatever you may, or may not, have proved by your arguments drawn from other topics; [b] you allow that the mere authority of the Samaritan pentateuch is not greater to prove, that the mount of the altar was Gerizim, than the mere authority of the Hebrew pentateuch is to prove, that it was Ebal. Nor can you deny, that the book of Joſhua, as it ſtands at preſent, is of as good authority as the pentateuch of the Hebrews. From hence then it follows clearly, that the book of Joſhua, as it ſtands at preſent, is of as good authority as the pentateuch of the Samaritans. When therefore you ſay, that the chronicon of the Samaritans is of little authority in compariſon of the Samaritan pentateuch, you might have added, that it is likewiſe of little authority in compariſon of the Hebrew book of Joſhua. Thus the evidence of the chronicle, which in the text of your diſſertation had weight enough to balance the evidence of the book of Joſhua, as it ſtands in the Hebrew bible, appears from your own confeſſion in your note to be of too little weight in the preſent queſtion to be worth regarding. To apologize to your readers for oppoſing ſuch a hiſtory as this to the Hebrew bible, you tell them without reſerve, that though you knew it to be of little authority, yet as you could get no better evidence, you choſe rather to produce this, than to have none at all.

I have now gone through your defence of the Samaritan pentateuch, as far as the reading, in Deut.

[b] Diſſ. 2. pag. 27. 28.

Deut. xxvii. 4, is concerned. And I perſuade myſelf, that I have ſhewn the reader, and perhaps may have ſhewn you, ſeveral inſtances of inaccuracy and of injudicious reaſoning in this part of your diſſertation: and as occaſion offered, I have likewiſe pointed out ſome inſtances of both ſorts in other parts of your work. If you will give yourſelf the trouble of reading what follows, you may find ſome very conſiderable ones added to the foregoing collection.

The firſt paſſage, which I would have you reconſider, has ſome connection with the queſtion, which we have been diſcuſſing: for though it does not relate particularly to the reading of the Samaritans, Deut. xxvii. 4, it ſeems to have been deſigned as a recommendation of their copy of the pentateuch. — "There "is, [a] you ſay, a very remarkable difference between "the Samaritan and the Hebrew copies in the book "of Exodus. The ſpeeches, on account of the ſo"lemn embaſſy from God to Pharaoh by Moſes, are "expreſſed in the Samaritan text *twice*; firſt, as given "in charge by God to Moſes; ſecondly, as repeated "by Moſes to Pharaoh; juſt as the principal meſſages "are recorded twice in Homer. Whereas in the pre"ſent Hebrew text the ſpeeches are recorded *once* only, "and that with great appearance of irregularity; ſome"times we have a ſpeech, as from God to Moſes, "without reading, that Moſes delivered it; and ſome"times, as from Moſes to Pharaoh, without reading, "that God had commanded it. — Should the Jews, "you ſay, have omitted theſe ſeveral ſpeeches, there "is one obvious reaſon to be given for it, that they "did it for brevity. Not with intention to falſify and "corrupt; but becauſe theſe ſpeeches, being all ex"preſſed once, might ſafely be omitted a ſecond time, "and the trouble of unneceſſarily retranſcribing them "might well be ſpared. — And as a proof, that the "*duplication* of theſe ſpeeches was omitted by the "Jews in the reign of Ptolemy, at leaſt in proof, that "ſome jewiſh hiſtory recorded ſuch a thing, and that "the

[a] Diſſert. 2. pag. 307. 309. 312. 313.

" the latter jews themſelves believed it, you produce " the words of B. Chaim, who in your opinion ſeems " to confeſs it; when he ſays — inſpice diligentius " hiſtoriam Ptolemæi regis, nempe in 13 locos, quos " illi immutarunt, quoniam expreſſe indicarunt, quare " immutarunt illos; et quicquid immutabant fuit in " eo, quod ipſi ſcribebant. — The original word דבר " which is here rendered *locos*, ſignifies, you ſay, in " Hebrew and in Chaldee, not only *a word*, but alſo " a collection of words formed into *a command* or *a* " *ſpeech*, as is evident from 1 Kings iii. 10. where " (ſpeaking of Solomons prayer) הדבר is rendered " *the ſpeech*, and from Buxtorfs chald. lexicon, which " renders דבור and דבר *verbum, ſermo, oratio.* — And " the number of the ſpeeches, repeated in the Sama- " ritan copy of Exodus, but not in the Hebrew, is in " your reckoning exactly 13; the very number men- " tioned in the preceding teſtimony: for the follow- " ing is a liſt of thoſe ſpeeches in Exodus, which (you " preſume) have been thus omitted in the preſent " hebrew,

" Exod. vi.	9.	—Iſraelites to Moſes.	Speech 1.
" vii.	18.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 2.
" viii.	4.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 3.
" viii.	5.	—Moſes to Aaron.	—— 4.
" viii.	23.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 5.
" ix.	5.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 6.
" ix.	19.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 7.
" x.	6.	—Moſes to Pharaoh.	—— 8.
" xi.	4.	—God to Moſes.	—— 9.
" xviii.	24.	—Moſes to Iſraelites.	—— 10.
" xx.	17.	—God to Iſraelites.	—— 11.
" xx.	19.	—Iſraelites to Moſes	—— 12.
" xx.	22.	—God to Moſes.	—— 13."

[b] Walton, if you had conſulted him, would have informed you where this ſtory, about 13 places having been varied from the original by the LXX in their tranſlation, had been told many years before the time of

[b] Prolegom. ix. 16.

of B. Chaim. — " In verſione græca τῶν ὁ, [Talmu-
" dici] loca 13 memorant, quæ Sept. aliter de in-
" duſtria tranſtulerunt, ne Ptolemæi regis ethnici a-
" nimum offenderent, vel occaſionem ſcandali darent,
" vel pravæ cogitationis, aliqua in lege ſiniſtre intel-
" ligendi. Hoc in utroque Talm. tract. Megillah et
" ab aliis judæorum ſcriptoribus refertur" — But then unluckily for you he adds — " ipſaque loca in Talm.
" recenſentur —

" 1 ——— Gen. i. 1.
" 2 ——— Gen. i. 26.
" 3 ——— Gen. ii. 2.
" 4 ——— Gen. xi. 7.
" 5 ——— Gen xviii. 12.
" 6 ——— Gen. xlix. 6.
" 7 ——— Exod. iv. 20.
" 8 ——— Exod. xii. 40.
" 9 ——— Exod. xxiv. 11.
" 10 ——— Levit. xi. 5.
" 11 ——— Num. xvi. 25.
" 12 ——— Deut. iv. 19.
" 13 ——— Deut. xvii. 3."

[e] Leuſden in his liſt omits Deut. xvii. 3. and inſerts Gen. v. 2. — Take which of the two liſts you will, it differs from yours in every article.

Leuſden indeed makes this remark — " Hæc ſunt
" tredecim loca, quæ vulgo ab illis interpretibus
" propter certas rationes mutata eſſe dicuntur. Verum
" enimvero hæc omnia loca jam tali modo in verſione
" Græca non inveniuntur, ſicuti 70 interpretes ex ſen-
" tentia Talmudiſtarum ea correxiſſe vel potius cor-
" rupiſſe dicuntur." — Walton too ſays — " Ex loco-
" rum inſpectione patebit, pleraque cum textu hebræo
" convenire, ejuſque vel verba vel ſenſum referre, ita
" ut hæc obſervatio merito inter fabulas rabbinicas
" numerari poſſit." And then, after ſhewing that the tranſlation of the LXX in moſt of theſe paſſages agrees with the preſent Hebrew text, he adds; — " Videmus

[e] Philolog. hebræo-mixt. pag. 23. 24.

" demus itaque mutationes iſtas, exceptis duabus vel " tribus, omnes confictas eſſe: unde eſt, quod apud " Joſephum et Philonem, qui tranſlationem iſtam " fuſe deſcripſerunt, nulla ſit earum mentio. In " rabbinorum itaque cerebris natæ." Upon the whole, therefore if, inſtead of building an arbitrary hypotheſis upon an obſcure hint, which you had met with in B. Chaims preface, you had ſearched into this matter a little more accurately; you would have found, either that your liſt of ſuch places, as were altered by the Jews in the reign of Ptolemy, is falſe from one end to the other; or elſe, that this whole argument, which you [d] urge in favour of the Samaritan text, has no better foundation than a rabbinical fable.

Perhaps you would have us grant, that 13 places were altered by the Jews in the reign of Ptolemy, but that the Talmudiſts have given us a wrong liſt of them. This would be too much to aſk: becauſe the truth of the fact, that 13 places were altered, and the truth of this liſt depend upon one and the ſame authority.

However, if we knew only, what you collected from B. Chaim, that according to a rabbinical tradition [e] 13 *changes were made by the Jews in that, which they wrote for Ptolemy*, without knowing what places the Talmudiſts ſuppoſe to have been altered; we might eaſily ſee, that your liſt, to ſpeak in the mildeſt terms, has nothing elſe to ſupport it, beſides an inaccurate repreſentation of facts.

In the firſt place; B. Chaim does not give the leaſt intimation, that theſe 13 changes were all made in the book of Exodus. You had therefore no other reaſon, that I am aware of, for ſuppoſing them to be confined to this book, except, that this ſuppoſition appeared to be moſt convenient for your purpoſe. The ſpeeches indeed on account of the ſolemn embaſſy from God to Pharaoh by Moſes are all in this book. But B. Chaim does not confine theſe changes to the hiſtory of this embaſſy: and you have inſerted ſome ſpeeches

[d] Diſſert. 2. pag 308. 309. [e] Diſſ. 2. pag. 310.

ſpeeches into your liſt, which cannot be ſaid to have been made on account of it. For the ſpeech of Moſes to the Iſraelites, which we find twice in the pentateuch of the Samaritans at Exod. xviii. 24. as well as at Deut. i. 9. &c. and only once in the pentateuch of the Hebrews at Deut. i. 9. &c. was ſpoken after they came out of Egypt, and is as follows — "I am not able to bear you myſelf alone. The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and behold, ye are this day as the ſtars of heaven for multitude. The Lord God of your fathers make you a thouſand times ſo many more as ye are, and bleſs you, as he hath promiſed you. How can I myſelf bear your cumbrance and your burden and your ſtrife? Take from among you wiſe men, underſtanding, and prudent according to your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you; and they ſhall anſwer and ſpeak the good thing, which thou ſhalt tell them to do." [Or rather "and they, that is, the people, anſwered and ſaid, the thing, which thou haſt ſpoken is good for us to do."] — The ſpeeches of God to the Iſraelites, Exod. xx. 17. — of the Iſraelites to Moſes, xx. 19. — and of God to Moſes, xx. 22. — have as little to do with the embaſſy to Pharaoh as this has.

It is true, that there are ſeveral ſpeeches to be found in the Samaritan copy of Exodus, which are not in the Hebrew copy of this book. But this difference, between the two copies is not peculiar to the book of Exodus. From other parts of the pentateuch you might to your preſent liſt of 13 ſpeeches have added 17 more.

Num. x.	10.—God to Moſes.	Speech 1.
—— xiii.	1.—Moſes to the Iſraelites.	—— 2.
—— xiii.	34.—Iſraelites to Moſes.	—— 3.
—— ibid.	—— Moſes to Iſraelites.	—— 4.
—— xiv.	40.—God to Moſes.	—— 5.
—— xx.	13.—Moſes to God.	—— 6.
—— ibid.	—— God to Moſes.	—— 7.
—— ibid.	—— God to Moſes.	—— 8.

Num.

Num. xxi.	11.—God to Moſes.	Speech 9.
—— ——	12.—God to Moſes.	—— 10.
—— ——	20.—God to Moſes.	—— 11.
—— ——	22.—Iſraelites to Sihon.	—— 12.
—— ——	23.—God to Moſes.	—— 13.
—— xxvii.	23.—Moſes to Joſhua.	—— 14.
—— xxxi.	21, &c.—Moſes to Eleazar.	—— 15.
Deut. ii.	7.—Moſes to the king of Edom.	—— 16.
—— ibid.	—The king of Edom to Moſes.	—— 17.

Part of the ſpeech of the Iſraelites to Sihon is in the pentateuch of the Hebrews, as well as in that of the Samaritans, both at Num. xxi. 22, and at Deut. ii. 27. 28. 29: but as the other part of it, which is twice in the Samaritan copy, is only once in the Hebrew, it has as good a right to a place in the liſt of theſe ſpeeches, as one which you have inſerted into your liſt, I mean the ſpeech of God to Moſes Exod. xi. 4. [3.] for part of this likewiſe, though not the whole, is twice in the Hebrew copy.—Perhaps you may chuſe to conſider the two ſpeeches of God to Moſes, Num. xx. 13, only as one: but even in this reckoning the number of ſpeeches, which are twice in the Samaritan copy of the pentateuch, and only once in the Hebrew copy will be 29; and this is above double the number of thoſe places, which B. Chaim ſays were altered in the reign of Ptolemy. However, theſe are certainly two different ſpeeches, though they are inſerted together in the Sam. pentateuch, at Num. xx. 13: for it appears, from comparing them with Deut. iii. 26.—28, and Deut. ii. 3.—6, either in this or in the Hebrew pentateuch, that they were ſpoken at different times.—Thus your liſt of 13 ſpeeches, if you did not know of theſe others, is an inaccurate one. And you may as well ſubmit to have it called ſo, if you did know, that there were ſo many more than 13, and yet deſignedly ſaid nothing of the reſt: becauſe if you will not allow us to call it inaccurate, we muſt call it by a worſe name.

You will ſcarcely ſay, that you omitted theſe ſpeeches in the book of Numbers, becauſe, though they are twice

ex-

expreſſed in the pentateuch of the Samaritans, yet they are not twice expreſſed there in the book of Numbers itſelf: for upon this principle your own liſt from the book of Exodus would be reduced to 9; becauſe 4 of the ſpeeches mentioned in it, though they are expreſſed twice ſomewhere or other in the Samaritan copy, are not expreſſed twice in the book of Exodus.

But ſecondly, your liſt of ſpeeches in the book of Exodus, which are twice expreſſed in the Samaritan and only once in the Hebrew copy, is inaccurate. At Exod. xi, in the Samaritan copy we read; "1. And the Lord ſaid "unto Moſes, yet will I bring one plague more upon "Pharaoh and upon Egypt, and afterwards he ſhall let "you go hence; when he ſhall let you go, he ſhall "ſurely thruſt you out hence altogether. 2. Speak now "in the ears of the people; and let every man borrow "of his neighbour, and every woman of her neigh-"bour *veſſels* of ſilver and *veſſels* of gold *and raiment.* "3. And *I will give this* people favour in the ſight of "the Egyptians, *and they ſhall lend unto them.* 4. *And* "*about midnight will I go out into the midſt of the land* "*of Egypt*; *and every firſt-born in the land of Egypt* "*ſhall die*; *from the firſt-born of Pharaoh, who ſitteth* "*upon his throne, unto the firſt-born of the maid-ſer-*"*vant, that is behind the mill, and all the firſt-born of* "*beaſts.* 5. *And there ſhall be a great cry throughout all* "*the land of Egypt, ſuch as there was none like it, nor* "*ſhall be like it any more.* 7. *But againſt any of the* "*children of Iſrael ſhall not a dog move his tongue, a-*"*gainſt man or beaſt, that thou mayeſt know, that the* "*Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and* "*Iſrael.* And alſo the man Moſes was very great in "the land of Egypt in the ſight of Pharaohs ſer-"vants, and in the ſight of the people. And Mo-"ſes ſaid unto Pharaoh, *Thus ſaith the Lord*; *Iſrael* "*is my ſon, my firſt-born: and I ſay unto thee*; *let* "*my ſon go, that he may ſerve me. And if thou refuſe* "*to let him go, behold the Lord will ſlay thy ſon, thy* "*firſt-born.* And Moſes ſaid; Thus ſaith the Lord; "about midnight will I go out into the midſt of the

"land

" land of Egypt, and every firſt-born in the land of " Egypt ſhall die; from the firſt-born of Pharaoh, " who ſitteth upon his throne, unto the firſt-born of " the maid-ſervant, that is behind the mill, and all " the firſt-born of beaſts. And there ſhall be a great " cry throughout all the land of Egypt; ſuch as there " was none like it, nor ſhall be like it any more. " But againſt any of the children of Iſrael ſhall not " a dog move his tongue againſt man or beaſt, that " thou mayeſt know, that the Lord doth put a diffe- " rence between the Egyptians and Iſrael. 8. And all " theſe thy ſervants ſhall come down unto me, and " bow down themſelves unto me ſaying, Get thee " out, and all the people, that follow thee; and after " that I will go out."—What is here printed in Italics is in the Samaritan copy only: the reſt is in the Hebrew copy as well as in that. The reader therefore may obſerve, that part of the ſpeech of *God to Moſes*, which begins at the firſt verſe, though not the whole of it, is in the Hebrew copy. This however is one of the 13 ſpeeches, which *you preſume* to have been omitted in the preſent Hebrew copy of Exodus. Your reference to it is — Exod. xi. 4; though in the London polyglott the inſertion begins from verſe the 3d, according to the common diviſion. But when I charge your liſt of the differences between the two copies of the pentateuch in the book of Exodus with being inaccurate in this part, I call it ſo, not on account of this reference, which I ſhould not have mentioned, if I had not been afraid, that the reader, when he compares my obſervation with your book, might miſunderſtand me: nor yet on accounnt of your inſerting this difference into the liſt of ſpeeches, which, *you preſume*, have been omitted in the preſent Hebrew copies, though it is a difference only of part of a ſpeech and not of a whole one: but becauſe at verſe 7th there is a ſpeech of Moſes to Pharaoh, which you have omitted; though as part of it is not to be found in this paſſage in the Hebrew copy, it had as good a right to a place in your liſt as the foregoing one of God to Moſes. If

you

you had inſerted it, as you ought; it would have made the number of theſe ſpeeches in Exodus 14.

I have already tranſcribed [f] a ſpeech of Moſes to the Iſraelites, which we find in the Samaritan pentateuch at Exod. xviii. 24, and not in the Hebrew. This ſpeech is one of the 13 in your liſt. But the Samaritan pentateuch goes on thus — "And he [Moſes] took the heads of the tribes, men wiſe and underſtanding, and appointed them heads over them; rulers of thouſands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens, and officers according to their tribes. And he commanded their judges ſaying, Hear the cauſes between your brethren, and ye ſhall judge righteouſly between a man and his brother, and the ſtranger. Ye ſhall not reſpect perſons in judgment: ye ſhall hear the ſmall as well as the great: ye ſhall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgment is the Lords. And the thing, which is too hard for you, ye ſhall bring unto me and I will hear it; and I will command you all the things, that ye ſhall do." This ſpeech of Moſes to the judges of Iſrael in particular, as well as that to the Iſraelites in general, is expreſſed twice in the Samaritan pentateuch, and is to be found only once in the Hebrew copy: this therefore, as well as that, ought to have been inſerted into your liſt. Thus the number of theſe ſpeeches in the book of Exodus only, if you had been accurate in collecting them, would have amounted to 15 inſtead of 13.

Mr. Whiſton, in whoſe appendix moſt of theſe double ſpeeches may be ſeen, has obſerved, [g] that "the Samaritan copy, beſides others entirely wanting, has near thirty large paſſages or repetitions in the pentateuch, which the modern Hebrew wants, and which yet the old plain method in the bible elſewhere, and in Homer one of the antienteſt heathen authors now extant, gives us reaſon to expect; and which indeed the coherence ſometimes requires: of the addition of which in the Samaritan no reaſon can be aſſigned; but

[f] At pag. 124. [g] Eſſay, &c. pag. 167.

" but of the omiſſion of which in the Hebrew the " reaſon is obvious, becauſe the ſame paſſages being " repeated might be left out in one of the places. So " that it appears from the plain and honeſt repetition " of them all in the Samaritan, that this is the full and " compleat copy; and that the preſent Hebrew does " here, as well as in other places, abridge the hiſtory, " and omit ſome parts of the ſame." Any one, who will compare this paſſage in Mr. Whiſtons book with what I have tranſcribed, at page 120, from yours, may eaſily ſee to whom you are obliged for the obſervation, which I have been examining, though you have not mentioned his name. And the reader would probably have had a better opinion of your accuracy, if you had been contented to retail it as you found it, without attempting to mend it by your own refinements.

But though you make no acknowledgments to Whiſton, when you borrow his arguments and obſervations; it muſt be owned, that where you have received any helps from ſuch men of learning as are now living, you take great care to pay all proper court and reſpect to them. The misfortune is, that you ſometimes compliment them upon ſuch occaſions and in ſuch a manner, as to betray your own want of attention. Of this we have the following inſtance. " [a] Some, you ſay, have thought that the firſt book " of apocryphal Eſdras exiſted formerly in Hebrew; " and this is one reaſon for its being objected —that " *one whole book is now loſt out of the ſacred canon.* " It may be of conſequence to confute this opinion, " and prevent future contentions about this book, " which may be done by obſerving—that except *one* " *long ſtory* (and a very few verſes varied deſignedly, " and alſo ſome accidental corruptions) the book is " nothing more nor leſs than *a copy of what is now* " *related in the books properly canonical.* It was in " all probability extracted by ſome very antient Jew, " for

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 506. 507.

" for the ſake of his inſerting in it the long ſtory " concerning *wine*, *women*, *and truth*, which he " might learn from Joſephus, or Joſephus from " him. You then tell your reader, that you will " ſpecify the particular places, from which the parts " of Eſdras are taken, as ſoon as you have acquaint- " ed him, that for this conſiderable diſcovery he is " obliged to the reverend and very learned Mr. San- " ford, fellow of Baliol college, to whom you muſt " here expreſs your gratitude for this and many other " excellent obſervations. Theſe places are

" Eſdras from i. 1. to i. 23. taken from 2 Chron. xxxv. 1. to xxxv. 20.
" ——— i. 25. to ii. 1. ——— xxxv. 20. to xxxvi. 22.
" ——— ii. 1. to ii. 16. ——— Ezra i. 1. to ii. 1.
" ——— ii. 16. to iii. 1. ——— iv. 7. to v. 1.
" ——— iii. 1. to v. 7. ——— *the long interpolated ſtory.*
" ——— v. 7. to vi. 1. ——— Ezra ii. 1. to iv. 6.
" ——— vi. 1. to ix. 37. ——— v. 1. to end.
" ——— ix. 37. to end. ——— Nehem. viii. 1. to viii. 13."

I have not the honour of knowing Mr. Sanford any otherwiſe than by character: and I am perſuaded from what I have heard of his great learning and exactneſs, that whatever you might think, he knew very well, that he was not the firſt who diſcovered, that the ſeveral parts of apocryphal Eſdras ſpecified in this liſt are to be found in the places here referred to.

A man muſt read with very little attention, who does not find out, that this book is in many places very like 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah: And if this likeneſs ſhould put him upon comparing them, the marginal references in our Engliſh verſion would point out the places to him. Or if you think, that no one, by what he had obſerved in reading the firſt book of apocryphal Eſdras, was ever led to make this uſe of the marginal references; yet certainly they, by whom theſe references were made, knew, that the ſeveral parts of this book may be found in thoſe three canonical ones.

What

What we have here called the firſt book of apocryphal Eſdras, Le Clerc calls the third book of Eſdras, reckoning the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah as the two firſt. And if you will look into his [b] *Ars Critica*, you will find, that though he takes no notice of the 2d book of Chronicles, yet he was certainly acquainted with the principal part of this obſervation, and ſpeaks of it as what was commonly known — "Notum eſt eum, qui tertium Eſdræ "librum edidit Græce pleraque, quæ habet, ex He"braicis Eſdræ et Nehemiæ codicibus ſumpſiſſe."

[c] Du Pin writes, to the ſame purpoſe, that "the "third [book of Eſdras] which we have in Greek is "only a recapitulation of the two firſt."

[d] Sir Iſaac Newton is of opinion, that "the book "of Ezra was originally a part of the book of *Chro*"*nicles*, becauſe it begins with the two laſt verſes of "the book of *Chronicles*; *and the firſt book of Eſdras* "*begins with the two laſt chapters thereof.*" And not long afterwards he ſays, that "[e] the book of *Ezra* "has been ſeparated from the book of *Chronicles* and "ſet together in two different orders; in one order in "the book of *Ezra*, received into the canon, and in "another order in the firſt book of Eſdras."

[f] You quote this very chapter of Sir Iſaac Newton: we may therefore preſume, that you have read it. And [g] you ſpeak of Du Pin as a writer, with whoſe works you are well acquainted. Indeed neither of them have ſaid, that any part of the firſt book of apocryphal Eſdras was taken from Nehemiah: but they have ſaid enough, if you had read their books with attention, to have prevented you from thinking, that the whole of this obſervation is a new diſcovery. Le Clerc would have ſhewn you, that the reſt of it is not new: but I cannot charge you with having read

[b] P. iii. S. i. C. xvi. parag. 41. [c] Hiſtory of Canon, &c. fol. B. i. c. 1. Sect. viii. pag. 26. [d] Obſervations upon Daniel, P. i. c. i. pag. 9. [e] Ibid. pag. 11. [f] Diſſ. 2, pag. 295. 296. [g] Diſſ. 2. 159.

read his *Ars Critica* careleſly; for as you never refer to this book, and ſeem to be very little acquainted with the rules of criticiſm, which are laid down in it, there is reaſon to believe, that you have never read it at all.

But you have read Whiſtons *Eſſay towards reſtoring the true text of the old teſtament*. This I collect, not from your referring to it, where you make uſe of ſuch arguments, as you have borrowed from him; for there you take care to keep him, and his book, as much out of ſight as you can; but I collect it partly from your copying him ſo cloſely in your defence of the Samaritan pentateuch, and partly from your referring once to his book in the manner, which [h] I have mentioned above. This writer thought, that what we call the firſt book of apocryphal Eſdras is in reality the canonical book of Ezra. —— He could not therefore conſiſtently with this opinion ſay, as you do, that the ſeveral parts of this book are *taken* from different places in Ezra and Nehemiah and Chronicles; becauſe he conſidered it as an original work. But he knew, that the ſeveral parts of it agree with the ſame places of thoſe three books, which you have ſpecified. This the reader will find by comparing the liſt of places, which [i] I have juſt now tranſcribed from your book, with the following paſſage in his *Eſſay*. " [k] *N. B.* The preſent apocryphal Eſdras, " ſo called, though it be really the canonical one, " ſeems to be a little imperfect and diſordered as we " now have it. Its 1ſt chapter begins with *Joſiahs* " *famous paſſover*, or with what now belongs to the " 2 laſt chapters of the 2d book of *Chronicles* (as " does the other copy begin with the two laſt verſes " of the ſame book) which was probably written by " Ezra alſo. It then agrees with the Hebrew Ezra " pretty well as to *Cyrus's* decree, &c. in the iid. " chapter. In the iiid, ivth, and vth chapters, which are

[h] See pag. 6. [i] See above at pag. 130.
[k] Whiſtons Eſſay, &c. pag. 53. 54.

" are entirely omitted in the Hebrew, it contains " an earlier account of the occaſion of *Zerubbabels* " promotion at court, under *Darius* the *Mede*, and " his three prime counſellors, or preſidents; and " of the occaſion of the firſt decree of this *Da-* " *rius* for the reſtoration of the Jews, &c. which hi- " ſtory having been erroneouſly applied to *Darius* " *Hyſtaſpis* by *Joſephus* and others, (though it be " rightly applied by *Ben Gorion*;) theſe chapters " ſeem to have been inſerted in a wrong place of " this book. The vith, viith, viiith and ixth chap- " ters, ſo far as ver. 36. of the ixth chapter, agree " well enough with the Hebrew Ezra, which *ends* there. " But then, as for the laſt 19 verſes of the ixth chap- " ter, they are much the ſame with the laſt verſes " of the viith and the firſt 12 verſes of the viiith " chapter of Nehemiah, where this book now ends; " and ſoon after which it appears to have ended in " the days of Joſephus alſo. All which obſervations " and remarks highly deſerve the review and reconſi- " deration of the learned."———The queſtion between you and me is not, whether this firſt book of Eſdras is really the canonical one? nor whether Whiſton could think it ſo, conſiſtently with this obſervation? nor yet whether your judgment of what you call an interpolated ſtory or his judgment of the ſame ſtory is the truer? but, whether you are accurate in collecting and repreſenting facts, when after having read his *Eſſay*, *where the particular places are ſpecified, in which the ſeveral parts of Eſdras may be found* [as he would ſay, or *from which they are taken*, as you ſay] you acquaint us, that for this conſiderable diſcovery we are obliged to *Mr. Sanford*? The reader, I am perſuaded, will find no difficulty in determining this queſtion.

To confirm what you call [a] " the occaſional con- " formity of the printed Chaldee paraphraſe," you produce Prov. xviii. 22. מצא אשה מצא טוב ויפק רצון

[a] Diſſ. 2. pag. 189. &c.

מיהוה *Whoſo findeth a wife, findeth a good thing; and obtaineth favour from the Lord*;—and aſk whether it "can be truly ſaid, that every wife is a bleſſing? Whether an univerſal maxim of this nature could proceed from the wiſeſt of men? Whether ſuch a proverb could be delivered by him, who repreſents the evil and the fooliſh woman as a curſe—by him, who ſays, that the contentions of a wife are a continual dropping; and ſhe, that maketh aſhamed is as rottenneſs in her husbands bones—by him, who, to enforce it with particular emphaſis, aſſures us in two ſeparate proverbs, that it is better to dwell in the wilderneſs, than with a contentious and angry woman." You then go on to ſhew in what manner he praiſes a virtuous woman, and aſk farther,—"Whether he, who diſcriminates ſo wiſely between the merit of a good woman and the demerit of the contrary, can be ſuppoſed in this inſtance to have ſaid—he, who findeth any wife, findeth a bleſſing? eſpecially when he ſo very cautiouſly confines this bleſſing every where elſe to a wife adorned with wiſdom; and when he ſo expreſsly tells us, that only *a prudent wife is from the Lord.*" And after referring us to Ecclus. xxv. and xxvi. "where the excellencies, that render a wife truly amiable and juſtly eligible, are beautifully diſplayed; as alſo thoſe miſeries, which attend a connexion with one of an oppoſite character; you preſume upon the whole, that Solomon in the text before us expreſſed himſelf thus, "*He that findeth* [אשה טובה] *a* good *wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favour from the Lord.*"—This, if I am not much miſtaken, the reader, when he comes to examine it, will find to be a ſtrong inſtance of injudicious criticiſm. For may not we aſk in return, whether the wiſeſt of men could deliver this uninſtructive proverb?—Whoſo findeth a good wife, findeth a good thing—ſuch a propoſition as this may be ranked amongſt thoſe trifling ones

mentioned by [b] Mr. Locke, in which the *genus* is predicated of the *ſpecies*; or indeed amongſt thoſe, which he calls identical ones; for it amounts to no more than this—Whoſo findeth what is good, findeth what is good.

Thus far I agree with you, that Solomon did not mean, that he, who findeth a wife, of whatever ſort ſhe is, findeth a good thing. But we may learn from himſelf what he meant, and how this proverb in the preſent reading is to be underſtood, when he ſays in [c] Eccleſiaſtes—"One *man* [אדם] amongſt a thouſand have I found, but *a woman* [אשה] amongſt all thoſe have I not found."—What! only one man amongſt a thouſand men? and only one woman amongſt a thouſand women? If we underſtand Solomon ſo litttle, as to aſk theſe queſtions, we may learn his meaning from the philoſopher, [d] who lighted a candle at noon and ſaid ανθρωπον ζητω, I look for *a man*. He need not have been at this trouble to find a man; if he had only wanted to find *animal implume, bipes, latis unguibus*, a man in general of any ſort whatſoever. What he looked for was a man, who acts up to the proper character and deſerves the name of a man. Or we may learn Solomons meaning from Jeremiah, v. 1.—"[d] Run ye to and fro through the ſtreets of Jeruſalem, and ſee now and know and ſeek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find *a man*, if there be any, that executeth judgment;"—or from Shakeſpear in his [e] Julius Cæſar

———His life was gentle and the elements
So mix'd in him, that nature might ſtand up,
And ſay to all the world——*This was a man.*

Solomon in this paſſage of Eccleſiaſtes uſes the words [אדם] *man* and [אשה] *woman* in an emphatical ſenſe to denote, not a man or a woman of any ſort, but a man, who acts up to the proper character of a man, and

[b] Eſſay on human underſtanding. B. iv. c. 8. S. 4. 2. 3.
[c] Eccles. vii. 28. [d] Diog. Laert. v. 1. pag. 335.
[e] Act v. ſcene laſt.

and a woman, who acts up to the proper character of a woman. But if he uſes the word אשה in this emphatical ſenſe in the book of Eccleſiaſtes, where we tranſlate it *a woman*, why might not he uſe it in a like ſenſe in the book of Proverbs, where we tranſlate it *a wife?* The proverb, according to this explanation of it, is — "Whoſo findeth a wife, that acts up to the proper character and deſerves the name of a wife, findeth a good thing."

We have ſeen how weak your internal reaſons are for ſuppoſing the word [טובה] *good* to have been originally in this proverb; let us next conſider your external reaſons[f]. "This reading, you ſay, derives a "ſtrong confirmation from obſerving, that the epi-"thet for *good* is found uniformly in the Gr. Syr. Ar. "and vulgate verſions. But then being found in all "theſe verſions, and being *in your opinion* ſo mani-"feſtly wanting in the original," ſome one might aſk, "how comes it to be wanting alſo in the printed "Chaldee? You reply; that you had long ſince noted "this, as one clear inſtance, amongſt others, wherein "the Chaldee has been wilfully altered to render it "more uniform with the Hebrew, which had been "antecedently corrupted — And it gave you ſingu-"lar pleaſure to diſcover lately in the public library "at Cambridge a MS, which contains the Chald. "paraphraſe on the Pſalms, Job, Chron. and on the "book of Proverbs — and to find in this MS *the very* "*word* ſo long preſumed to be genuine, ſo long "thought to have been dropped deſignedly by ſome "corrector of this paraphraſe in compliment to the "corrupted original. The reading then in this MS is "as follows דמשכח איתא טבתא משכח טבתא qui "invenit uxorem bonam, invenit bonum. For the "more compleat confirmation of this example, you "acquaint your reader, that — Profeſſor Murſinna "aſſures you, that the Chaldee MS preſerved at "Berlin contains the very reading, which you found "in

[f] Diſſ. 2. p. 190. &c.

" in the Cambridge MS." Whether your finding the epithet for *good* in the Gr. Ar. Syr. and vulgate verſions, and in the Chaldee paraphraſe in two MSS is a ſtrong argument that the word טובה *good* was in the original, when theſe verſions were made, will appear, if we try an argument of the ſame ſort in another inſtance. — In our Engliſh tranſlation of Prov. xxii. 1, Solomon ſays, " A *good* name is rather to be " choſen than great riches." But the word טוב *good* is not in the Hebrew copies, from which the Engliſh verſion was made. If therefore our tranſlators have inſerted the word *good* Prov. xxii. 1, though they did not find טוב in the original; can we conclude, that any paraphraſt, or that any other tranſlators found טובה in the original of Prov. xviii. 22, becauſe they have inſerted the epithet for *good* in their paraphraſes or verſions? If any one ſhould reply, that in the Engliſh verſion the word *good* Prov. xxii. 1, is printed in Italics, which is a certain evidence, that it is not in the Hebrew; it might be time enough to think of giving him an anſwer, when he has ſhewn, that the Gr. Ar. Syr. and vulgate verſions, and likewiſe that the Chaldee paraphraſe have elſewhere any marks correſponding to our Italic characters, by which in other places they have diſtinguiſhed thoſe words, which they did not find, from thoſe, which they did find, in the Hebrew. For till this is ſhewn; we may ſay, that, as in our verſion the word *good* Prov. xxii. 1, is diſtinguiſhed by Italics, ſo the epithet for *good* might for any thing, that we know, have been diſtinguiſhed in the others by ſome ſuch mark; if the tranſcribers of them had had any ſuch. However; when we find a word printed in Italic letters in our Engliſh bibles, this is not a certain evidence, that the correſponding word is not in the original. I know that very great care was taken of this matter in a bible printed in duodecimo at Cambridge in the year 1743: and yet I find, that in Eccleſ. vii. 1,—"A good name is better than precious ointment"— the word *good* is in this bible printed in Italics, though the word טוב which

ſig-

ſignifies good is in the original. — But to return to Prov. xviii. 22. I have a ſtronger argument to prove, that the reading, which you contend for — He that findeth a *good* wife — is in our Engliſh verſion, than you have to prove, that the reading in the Hebrew ever was אשה טובה. Paraphraſts often inſert ſuch words, as have no words, that they may anſwer to in the original authors; and tranſlators ſometimes do the ſame thing. But the compilers of concordances are not uſed to take ſuch liberties: the nature of their work requires, that they ſhould always give us the preciſe words, which they find in the text and no others. Now in what is called the Cambridge-concordance, printed by Hayes, 1698, under the head *wife*, I read, — Prov. xviii. 22. findeth a good wife findeth a good thing. — If then the authority of verſions and of a paraphraſe will prove, that the reading in the Hebrew text, from which they were made, was, אשה טובה, the ſtronger authority of a concordance will prove, that in the Engliſh verſion, from which this concordance was compiled, the reading is — a *good* wife. But we know the concluſion, which is drawn from this ſtronger authority, to be falſe in fact: for — a *good* wife — is not the reading in the Engliſh verſion. Therefore the concluſion, which you draw from a weaker authority, is not to be depended on.

If you ſhould ſurmiſe, that poſſibly the bible, which the compiler of this concordance made uſe of, might read — a *good* wife, — ſuch a ſuppoſition would be too arbitrary and precarious to prove any thing; till you had confirmed it by producing ſome edition of the Engliſh bible, which has this reading. However; this very concordance may ſave you the trouble of looking for one: becauſe under the article *findeth* the reading is — findeth a wife — without the word *good:* from whence we may collect, that the edition, which the compiler of it uſed, did not in this place differ from the common ones.

They

They muſt be very inattentive readers, who can imagine, that the reading, which is to be met with under the article *findeth*, deſtroys my argument. It would do ſo, if I was endeavouring to prove, that the reading in our Engliſh verſion at the time of compiling this concordance was — a *good* wife : — but it ſhews my argument in its full ſtrength, as I was proving, that from finding the epithet for *good* in the Gr. Arab. Syr. and Vulg. verſions, or in two copies of a Chaldee paraphraſe, we cannot conclude, that the word טובה was in the Hebrew of Prov. xviii. 22, when theſe verſions and this paraphraſe were made: becauſe even the compiler of a concordance has inſerted in this very paſſage the word *good*, though we are ſure, that it was not in the text, which he had before him.

We read in 1 Sam. xvi. 14 — 23. that, "when Saul was troubled with an evil ſpirit, his ſervants adviſed him to ſeek out a man, who could play well on an harp, and recommended David the ſon of Jeſſe, as one, who was cunning in playing, and a mighty valiant man, and prudent in matters; and that David was accordinly taken into the ſervice of Saul, who loved him greatly and made him his armour-bearer". And yet in the xviith chapter we read, at v. 33, that "when David propoſed to fight with Goliath; Saul ſaid to him, Thou art not able to go againſt him; for thou art but a youth, and he a man of war from his youth; at v. 29, that David had not then been uſed to armour, for he gives this reaſon, why he deſired to put the armour off, with which Saul had furniſhed him; and at v. 55, that neither Saul nor Abner knew at this time whoſe ſon he was." Here are two difficulties, which have perplexed many of the commentators;— How did it happen, that David, who according to the order, in which this matter ſeems to be related, was made Sauls armour-bearer, and had been for ſome time in his family, before he fought with Goliath, ſhould yet at the time of this combat

be

be unknown both to Saul and to Abner his general? How did it happen, that David, who is firſt deſcribed as a valiant man and prudent in matters, ſhould afterwards be repreſented as a youth, unſkilled in war, and unuſed to armour?---There are ſome other difficulties in this hiſtory; but theſe are the principal ones: and if we enquire, how well Mr Pilkington [a] has cleared up theſe in his Remarks; we ſhall from thence be able to judge, whether we ſhould make uſe of the method, which he propoſes, for clearing up the reſt.

His general principle is, that all the paſſages in the xvith xviith and xviiith chapters, which are not in the Vatican MS of the LXX verſion, are interpolations. And this principle leads him to reject thirty-nine verſes out of eighty-eight, which we find in the Hebrew, and in the Alexandrian copy of the LXX. "[b] The authorities, which he brings to prove this "great interpolation are, you ſay, the internal evi- "dence ariſing from the *context*; and the external "ariſing from the *Vatican* copy of the Gr. verſion. "But how then reads the Alexandrian MS? *The re-* "*marks* acknowledge, that this MS agrees here with "the corrupted Hebrew" — But you can help the remarker to ſuch evidence to prove, that 20 of theſe thirty-nine verſes were interpolated, as he was not aware of — the internal evidence of the Alexandrian MS itſelf. You introduce this evidence with aſking, "What; "if the Alex. MS, which now has theſe verſes, ſhould "*itſelf* prove them interpolated? What; if *the very* "*words of this very MS* demonſtrate, that theſe verſes "were not in ſome former Gr. MS? Certainly if the "Alexandrian MS ſhould be thus found, at laſt, not "to contradict, but to confirm the Vatican, in its o- "miſſion of theſe 20 verſes; the concurrence of theſe "authorities will render the argument much more "forcible and convincing." — The reader will eaſily un-

[a] Remarks &c. pag. 63. — 76.

[b] Diff. 2. pag. 421. 422. 423. &c.

underſtand what follows, if as we go along he will be at the trouble of comparing Daniels and Grabes, editions of the LXX verſion with one another; or the text of Bos's edition with the notes. "The queſtion "is, whether the 20 verſes between ver. 11, and ver. "32, of chap. xviith, which are now in the Hebrew; "are interpolated or not?" To prove, that they are, you obſerve that the Vatican MS goes on immediately from verſe 11th, which ends with theſe words "και εφοβηθησαν σφοδρα — to verſe 32d, which begins "with και ειπε Δαυιδ, and ſo leaves out the 20 in-"termediate verſes. You obſerve farther, that the "12th verſe in the Hebrew begins not with a ſpeech, "but with Davids birth and parentage: and yet in "the Alexandrian copy of the LXX verſion this "12th verſe begins with και ειπε Δαυιδ. From hence "you infer, that the tranſcriber had a copy before "him, which agreed with the Vatican copy, and "having written what is now in the 11th verſe, he "was beginning what is now the 32d verſe; when "after writing, και ειπε Δαυιδ, he perceived, that "either the Hebrew, or ſome other Greek copy, or "the margin of his own copy, had ſeveral interme-"diate verſes: upon which without blotting out the "ſignificant word ειπε he went on to write the ad-"dition; thus fortunately leaving a deciſive proof of "his own great interpolation."

But the word, which you call a ſignificant one, is not ειπε, but ειπεν, in Grabes and in Waltons copies of the Alex. MS: for in theſe two editions the 12th verſe begins και ειπεν Δαυιδ. — You may be ready to ſay, that the difference between ειπεν and ειπε is a trifle not worth notice. In the meaning of the two words there is indeed no difference at all: and though you may think, that the difference of the letter ν, which is in one of theſe words and not in the other, is but a trifle; yet the value of it will be found upon examination to be as much as the whole argument is worth, which you introduce with ſo much parade, as *a demonſtration*

tion from the very words of the Alexandrian MS itſelf, that the 20 verſes in queſtion were not in ſome former Gr. MS. For if the word is ειπεν and not ειπε, I can upon ſuch principles of criticiſm, as you have elſewhere laid down, explane, how the tranſcriber having finiſhed the 11th verſe, which ends with και εφοβηθησαν σφοδρα, went on to write in the beginning of the next verſe και ειπεν, though the MS, from which he was tranſcribing this verſe did, not begin, as it does in the Vatican MS, with και ειπε. —— After he had written at the end of the 11th verſe και εφοβηθησαν σφοδρα, *he careleſly caſt his eye*, as you ſay [c] upon a like occaſion, thirteen verſes *farther forth*, and there at the end of what we reckon the 24th verſe in thoſe editions, which follow the Alexandrian copy, *he catched the ſame words* και εφοβηθησαν σφοδρα, and from thence went on to write και ειπεν, with which words the 25th verſe begins: but then finding his miſtake he went back to the 12th verſe [d] *and wrote on*, as you ſay other tranſcribers uſed to do, *without either blotting out or eraſing the word* ειπεν, *that he might not hurt the ſale of his edition by the diſcovery of his own careleſneſs*.—Perhaps you will reply, that though the 12th verſe in the Alexandrian MS does not begin with και ειπε, yet it begins with και ειπεν exactly as the 32d verſe begins in the ſame MS; and conſequently that, notwithſtanding this miſtake, your argument ſtands as it did, and will prove the interpolation as effectually, as if they had both begun with και ειπε. But a little attention to what I have been ſaying will ſhew you the contrary. If the 12th verſe in this MS had begun και ειπε, I could not have ſhewn you where the ſcribe, who wrote it, got theſe words: he certainly in this caſe could not have gotten them from the beginning of the 25th verſe, which muſt begin with και ειπεν, and could not begin with και ειπε, becauſe the firſt letter in the following word ανηρ is a vowel. But if the 12th verſe in the MS begins και ειπεν, then the tran-

[c] Diſſ. 1. pag. 418. [d] Diſſ. 1. pag. 370.

tranſcriber might have theſe words from the beginning of the 25th verſe: and ſince the words immediately preceding both the 12th verſe and the 25th verſe are και εφοβηθησαν σφοδρα, — it is more likely that the ſame words at the end of theſe two verſes miſled the eye of the tranſcriber, than that there is in this place an interpolationof 20 verſes.

When I made this remark, I had not ſeen Breitingers edition of the LXX. I have ſeen it ſince, and find that it reads ειπε here, though in the Oxford edition and in Waltons polyglott the word is ειπεν. But let us hear what the Oxford editor of this part of the Alexandrian copy [e] ſays of his own edition — "Hiſtoricorum, qui hoc tomo continentur, librorum "editio e codice Alexandrino, ut omnibus, quæ unquam fuerunt, longe perfectius evaderet, nihil ſibi "prætermittendum duxit Grabius. Hæc diu deſiderata, utpote præmatura ejus morte impedita, vigiliis "indefeſſis, diligentia ſumma, ingenio mirabili parata, "lectori chriſtiano ſe nunc ſiſtit. Edendi rationem, "quam Grabius ab initio ſecutus eſt, mutare nobis "religio fuit. Exemplar igitur ipſius, ſicut erat e co"dice MS deſcriptum, aliorumque exemplarium "vetuſtiſſimorum ope emendatum ſuppletumque da"mus — And in another [f] place — Certus eſſe po"teſt lector ſe verum ac genuinum, quoad fieri poteſt, "antiquiſſimæ hujus verſionis textum, ſecundum ex"emplar ejus Alexandrinum, hoc eſt vetuſtiſſimum, "fideliter expreſſum (ſupplendis tantummodo ſup"pletis, mendiſque emendatis) præ manibus habere. "Qui diligenter enim codicem ipſum MS cum ejus "apographo Grabiano (unde liber hic abſque vari"atione ulla impreſſus eſt) contulerunt, facta col"latione veritatem hanc publice profeſſi ſunt. Hujus "rei teſtes omni exceptione majores habemus virum "doctiſſimum Humfredum Wanley — perinde ac "celeberrimum Potterum.

Walton, in his prolegomena to the London polyglott ix. 34, in regard to the Alexandrian MS ſays of him-

[e] Proleg. c. ii. ſ. 1. [f] Proleg. c. i. ſ. 10.

himſelf,— "cui [mihi] religio eſt quicquam in tam "celebri MS immutare, niſi librarii manifeſtus error "poſtulabat. Integrum itaque hic exhibemus MS, "non mutatum, nec mutilatum vel interpolatum, "omnia lectoris docti et pii judicio ſubjicientes." In his polyglott the reading is ειπεν, as it is in the Oxford edition: and this, eſpecially after ſuch a declaration, is a farther evidence, that Grabes copy agrees with the MS. For it is very unlikely, that two ſuch men as Walton and Grabe, when they both profeſs to follow the MS with all poſſible exactneſs, ſhould both have had the ſame reading here, if it had not been the reading of the MS itſelf.

If, on the other hand, you have a mind to know how far Breitingers reading is to be depended upon; there is a paſſage in the laſt page of his preface to the firſt volume of his edition, which I will recommend to your peruſal — "Quod textum editionis noſtræ "attinet, de illo ſic habetote: nos editionem Oxon. "clariſſimi Grabii cura caſtigatam et illuſtratam ad "verbum ſumma fide et adhibita omni diligentia ex-"preſſiſſe; paucis quibuſdam immutatis, quæ ratio "hujus editionis poſtulabat — denique quoad priſ-"cum MS Alex. ſcribendi modum, quem in quibuſ-"dam locis ſequi voluit Cl. Grabe, ego ν illud epen-"theticum vocibus, quanquam ſequente conſona, ad-"fixum per integrum fere textum proſcripſi, quod in-"numeris vicibus rediret, et lectorem receptæ or-"thographiæ aſſuetum immorari potuiſſet.

I ſhall now leave it to the reader to determine, whether an accurate man would have ſuppoſed in any inſtance, that what he found in Breitinger was the true reading of the Alexandrian MS, without conſulting Grabes copy of the MS, or in preference to what he found in this copy of it, if he did conſult it: ſince Breitinger does not pretend to have recollated the MS, but profeſſes to follow that copy of it, which he found in the Oxford edition. If this would have been inaccurate in any other inſtance, how much more

more ſo in ſuch an inſtance, as this, which we are now conſidering; where, if the final ν in the word ειπεν was in the MS, Breitinger agreeably to a rule, which he gives his reader notice of in his preface, was very likely to leave it out. He has not indeed adhered very cloſely to his rule in the chapter now before us: and in his preface he had only told us, that he ſhould *commonly*, not that he ſhould *always*, obſerve it. However, he has followed it here in ſo many other inſtances, that with the leaſt degree of attention you might have been ſure, that his edition was not ſo likely, as the Oxford edition, to give us in this inſtance the true reading of the Alexandrian MS.

The reader may poſſibly be diſpoſed to imagine, that you went to the MS itſelf and fetched the *ſignificant* word ειπε from thence. But a very ingenious gentleman has been ſo kind as to conſult it for me upon this occaſion, and to favour me with a tranſcript of this paſſage, or rather with an exact imitation of the characters, abbreviations, and points, of the end of the 11th, the whole 12th, and the beginning of the 13th and likewiſe of the 32d verſes: and in his tranſcript the word in queſtion is ειπεν.

The learned librarian at the Britiſh Muſeum, Dr. Morton, to whom this gentleman acknowledges himſelf to be much obliged for his civilities, deſired him to obſerve the word Εφραθαι, which is not expreſſed, at v. 12, in the MS, as Bp. Walton and Dr. Grabe have printed it: for it is not Εφραθαιν, but Εφραθαι· with a ſtop after the ι· ſo that the following words are ου ουτος εκ Βηθλεεμ; as if הזה מבית לחם was tranſlated interrogatively—"was not this man of Bethlehem?" You ſee therefore, that however unlikely it may be, yet in ſome ſlight inſtances even Grabes and Waltons copies, where they agree with one another, may poſſibly not be exact repreſentations of the MS: and yet you truſted to Breitingers edition, which he declares to be only a copy of Grabes copy; and this too in an inſtance, where he had given you notice, that he was very likely to have varied from Grabe by deſign.

Having thus ſhewn, that the argument, by which you endeavour to prove from the internal evidence of the Alex. MS, that 20 verſes have been here interpolated, has nothing to ſupport it, beſides your groundleſs ſuppoſition that this MS reads ειπε, where the reading in the Oxford edition and in the Engliſh polyglott is ειπεν, I ſhall next enquire, how judicious you are in eſpouſing Mr. Pilkingtons method of clearing up the difficulties in this part of the ſacred hiſtory. The 55th, 56th, 57th, and 58th verſes of chap. xviith, in which Saul and Abner are repreſented as knowing little or nothing about David and his family, when he ſlew Goliath, are not in the Vatican MS: therefore by following the reading of this MS we ſhall get rid of one of the difficulties, which I mentioned above. But what ſhall we do with the other? for, chap. xvi. 18, we read in the Vatican MS itſelf, that one of Sauls ſervants, when he recommended David, ſaid of him — ιδε εωρακα υιον τω Ιεσσαι Βηθλεεμιτην, και αυτον ειδοτα ψαλμον, και ο ανηρ συνετος και πολεμις-ης·—"behold, I have ſeen the ſon of Jeſſe the Bethlehemite, a perſon ſkilful in playing; and *he is* a man of counſel and a warriour." This character of David reminds one of what [e] Salluſt ſays of Jugurtha — "Quod difficilli-"mum in primis eſt, et prælio ſtrenuus erat et bo-"nus conſilio." — The ſacred hiſtorian, according to the ſame MS, adds, at verſe 21, και εγενηθη αυτω αιρων τα σκευη αυτε, and "he [David] became his [Sauls] armour-bearer." And yet, c. xvii. v. 33, we read in this MS, that when David propoſed to fight with Goliath, Saul ſaid to him — ου μη δυνηση πορευθηναι προς τον αλλοφυλον τε πολεμειν μετ' αυτε, ὁτι παιδαριον ει συ, "thou art not able to go againſt this Philiſtine to fight with him, for thou art a youth" — and at v. 39, that, when David had been armed by Sauls order, — εκοπιασε περιπαληας απαξ και δις. και ειπε Δαυιδ προς Σαυλ, ὁ μη δυνωμαι πορευθηναι εν τυτοις ὁτι α πεπειραμαι, "he walked backwards and forwards once or twice with difficulty,

[e] Bell. Jugurth. vii.

culty, and ſaid I cannot go in theſe for I am unuſed to them" — David therefore, according to what in the Vatican MS ſeems to be the order of the hiſtory, was made Sauls armour-bearer, and before he was taken into Sauls family, was a man of counſel and valiant in war: and yet when he was afterwards going to fight with Goliath, he was but a youth and unexperienced in arms. What will you do with this difficulty? It would be too much to ſuppoſe, that the Vatican MS is of ſufficient authority to prove, that all the verſes, which are omitted in it, are interpolations; but that its authority is of no weight at all to prove, that the 33d and 39th verſes of the xviith chapter are genuine.

Some of the commentators, if you will conſult them, will explane this matter to you, and will ſhew you at the ſame time, that to clear up the two difficulties ariſing on the xvith, xviith, and xviiith chapters, as they ſtand at preſent in the printed Hebrew text and in the Alexandrian MS, it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe thirty-nine verſes out of eighty-eight to have been interpolated.

Malvenda, in his comment on c. xvi. 18, where David is recommended to Saul as a man of counſel and a warriour, remarks, that ſince he had given no ſpecimen of his valour, before he fought with Goliath, what is there ſaid of him is by many underſtood to be an anticipation, and that this hiſtory comes in, according to the order of time, after his killing of the Philiſtine: he repeats the ſame obſervation at c. xvii. 1; and again at c. xviii. 2, where he adds, that when we read — "Saul took David that day, and would let him go no more home to his fathers houſe" — we are to underſtand, not the day, in which he ſlew Goliath, but the day, in which he ſent to Jeſſe, c. xvi. 22, ſaying, — "let David, I pray thee, ſtand before me, for he hath found favour in my ſight;" — ſo that, as he had before remarked, at c. xvii. 1, what we read from this 1ſt verſe of c. xvii, to the 1ſt verſe of c. xviii inclu-

ſive, is added here out of the order of time, to inform the reader, how it happened, that David ſhould be known in Sauls court, and that one of Sauls ſervants ſhould recommend him as a warriour. You may find the ſame interpretation in [f] Piſcators comment on the old teſtament; and in Junius and Tremellius.

What in our Engliſh verſion, of c. xvii. 1, is — "Now the Philiſtines gathered together &c." might have been thus tranſlated — "Now the Philiſtines had gathered together" &c. — Sauls ſervants had recommended David to him as a ſkilful muſician, a man of counſel, and valiant in arms: and he upon this recommendation had ſent for David, had made him his armour-bearer, and had deſired Jeſſe, that he would let his ſon ſtay at court. The hiſtorian, having related, this in c. xvi, 14—23, inſtead of carrying on the thread of the hiſtory, makes a digreſſion, which begins with the 1ſt verſe of c. xvii. and ends with the 1ſt verſe of c. xviii, ſo that both theſe verſes are included in it. The deſign of this digreſſion is, to inform his readers of what had happened, before David was thus ſent for, and to explane both the occaſion of his being known by thoſe, who were about Saul, and likewiſe the reaſons, which they had to give him ſo high a character. The digreſſion is to this purpoſe — The Philiſtines had gathered their armies together; Goliath had challenged any Iſraelite to a ſingle combat; David, who came accidentally to the camp of the Iſraelites, had with Sauls leave accepted the challenge, and had ſlain Goliath. At this time, as we read c. xvii. 55 — 58, Saul knew nothing of David and his family: however, when David had given an account of himſelf, the ſoul of Jonathan was knit with the ſoul of David, who had juſt before wrought a great deliverance for Iſrael; and Jonathan loved him as his own ſoul. Here the digreſſion ends. It ſeems, that Saul,

[f] Schol. in 1 Sam. c. xvii. 1. et c. xviii. 1.

Saul, notwithſtanding the [g] offers, which he had made to any one, who ſhould kill Goliath, had let David go back to his fathers houſe unrewarded and unnoticed. But his behaviour in this combat had made him known amongſt Sauls ſervants, and was a ſufficient foundation for one of them, perhaps at the command of Jonathan, to remind him of David. And from the day of his being recalled for the purpoſes and upon the recommendation mentioned c. xvi. 14 — 23, Saul let him go back no more to his fathers houſe; as the hiſtorian, when he returns from his digreſſion, relates c. xviii. 2.

But after Davids return to court, when Saul would not let him return home any more; we read, c. xviii. 5 — 8, that "he went out whitherſoever Saul ſent him, and behaved himſelf wiſely, and Saul ſet him over the men of war; but that it came to paſs, as they returned from the ſlaughter of the Philiſtine, the ſongs, which the women ſung — Saul hath ſlain his thouſands and David his ten thouſands — made Saul jealous of him." As this is ſaid to have happened, "*whilſt* they came, when David returned from the ſlaughter of the Philiſtine;" it may be objected, that David fought with Goliath, not whilſt he was unknown to Saul, but after Saul had taken him into his train, had made him his armour-bearer, and would not ſuffer him to return any more to his fathers houſe. — The objection proceeds upon a ſuppoſition, that by the ſlaughter of the Philiſtine is here meant the ſlaughter of Goliath. But in the margin of our Engliſh verſion we read *Philiſtines*; as if את הפלשתי the Philiſtine was uſed in this place, as את החתי the Hittite, and את הכנעני the Canaanite are uſed, Gen. xv. 20. 21, and elſewhere, to ſignify not a ſingle perſon, but a nation. [h] Piſcator interprets this word in the ſame manner, as our tranſlators have done in their marginal verſion.

[g] 1 Sam. xvii. 25. [h] Schol. in cap. xviii. 5.

If you think it unlikely, that the writer of the book of Samuel, who upon other occaſions calls the Philiſtines פלשתים ſhould here call them הפלשתי, you have helped me to another ſolution of the objection: for in your firſt diſſertation, pag. 526, you ſay from Vitringa, that "the Jews in their antient copies "of the ſcriptures, as at preſent in their common "writing, frequently omitted the ם in ſuch words "as this, and ſignified it by a daſh, which upon fill-"ing up the abbreviated words was ſometimes not "obſerved, and thus the words were written as with-"out the ם ſo without the daſh."

The fact then, as related in this xviiith chapter, is as follows — After David was ſet over the men of war; upon his return with them from ſome battle with the Philiſtines, the particulars of which are not mentioned by the ſacred hiſtorians, and not as he was returning from the combat with Goliath, at which time he was unknown to Saul, and had no command in the armies; the women ſung this ſong, which gave occaſion to Sauls jealouſy. ———

"[a] The book of the law, which was found in the "temple by Hilkiah the prieſt in the days of Joſiah, "is called ספר תורת יהוה ביד משה *liber legis Je-"hovæ in manu* (or *per manum*) *Moſis*. 2 Chron. "xxxiv. 14. You think it ſcarce poſſible for words "more naturally to deſcribe a book written by Moſes "himſelf, or to vouch more fully, that the MS of "the law then found was in the hand-writing of Mo-"ſes."—You add—"Perhaps all doubt will be re-"moved, when it is conſidered farther; that though "there are 15 places in the Old Teſtament, which "mention the words *law of Moſes* and *book of Moſes*, "yet this one place only mentions *the book of the "law in the hand* (or *by the hand*) *of Moſes*: the rea-"ſon of which ſeems to you to be, that the other "places ſpeak of that law in general; but this place "ſpeaks of one particular MS, namely the original.

"You

[a] Diſſert. 2. p. 299. 300.

" You then call upon your readers to attend to this " ſingular diſtinction, and lay before them the fol- " lowing liſt of theſe 15 places,

" Joſh. viii. 31. ספר תורת משה *liber legis Moſis.*

" 1 Kin. ii. 3.—2 Kin. xxiii. 25. תורת משה *lex* " *Moſis.*

" 2 Kin. xiv. 6. ספר תורת משה *liber legis Moſis.*

" 2 Chron. xxiii. 18. xxx. 16. תורת משה *lex* " *Moſis.*

" 2 Chron. xxv. 4. xxxv. 12. ספר משה *liber Moſis.*

" Ezr. iii. 2. תורת משה *lex Moſis.*

" Ezr. vi. 18. ספר משה *liber Moſis.*

" Nehem. xiii. 1. ספר משה *liber Moſis.*

" Dan. ix. 11. 13. תורת משה *lex Moſis.*

" Mal. iv. 4. תורת משה *lex Moſis.*

" But 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14. ספר תורת יהוה ביד משה " *liber legis Jehovæ in manu Moſis.*"

To theſe 15 places in the old Teſtament, which mention the words *law of Moſes* and *book of Moſes*, you may add theſe four,

Joſh. viii. 32. את משנה תורת משה *exemplum legis Moſis.*

Joſh. xxiii. 6. הכתוב בספר תורת משה *quod ſcriptum eſt in libro legis Moſis.*

Nehem. viii. 1. את ספר תורת משה *librum legis Moſis.*

Ezr. vii. 6. סופר מהיר בתורת משה *ſcriba promptus in lege Moſis.*

And before you publiſh a ſecond edition of your diſſertation, you will do well to turn over Buxtorfs concordance, and ſee whether theſe words are not mentioned in more places, than theſe 19; that your enumeration may in that edition be more accurate, than it is in this.

You may be apt to reply, that the more places there are, where the words *law of Moſes*, or *book of Moſes* are mentioned; if only this one place mentions the book of the law *by the hand* (or as you would render it *in the hand)* of Moſes; the more your con-

cluſion, that the hiſtorian deſigned here to deſcribe a book in the hand-writing of Moſes, is ſtrengthened. Before I have done, I will ſhew you how juſt your concluſion is: at preſent, whilſt I am only examining the accuracy of your premiſes, this anſwer is nothing to the purpoſe. When you ſay, that there are 15 places, in which the words *law of Moſes* or *book of Moſes* are mentioned; did you know of any more, or did you not? If you did not; you were not accurate in making your enumeration. If you did; why did you ſay nothing of them? For whoever argues, as you pretend to do here, from an enumeration of particulars, if he deſignedly leaves out any of the particulars, argues inaccurately.

But if you would have tried fairly, whether the concluſion, which you wanted to eſtabliſh, is true or not; there are another ſet of places, which would have been more to your purpoſe, than thoſe, where the words *law of Moſes* or *book of Moſes* are mentioned: I mean thoſe, in which we find the words ביד משה *by the hand of Moſes*.—Such as Nehem. ix. 14. ומצוות וחקים ותורה צוית להם ביד משה עבדך *and commandedſt them precepts, ſtatutes, and a law by the hand of Moſes thy ſervant*.—Lev. viii. 36. כל הדברים אשר צוה יהוה ביד משה *all things, which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moſes*——Num. iv. 37. 45. ix. 23. x. 13. Joſh. xxii. 9. על פי יהוה ביד משה *according to the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moſes*—Nehem viii. 14. וימצאו כתוב בתורה אשר צוה יהוה ביד משה *and they found it written in the law, which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moſes*.—Levit. xxvi. 46. אלה החקים והמשפטים והתורת אשר נתן יהוה בינו ובין בני ישראל בהר סיני ביד משה *theſe are the ſtatutes and judgments and laws, which the Lord made between him and the children of Iſrael, in mount Sinai by the hand of Moſes*———2 Chron. xxxiii. 8. לכל התורה והחקים והמשפטים ביד משה *according to the whole law and the ſtatutes and the ordinances by the*

the hand of Moſes. —— There are many other places, in which it is as plain, as it is in theſe, that the meaning of the words ביד משה *by the hand of Moſes* is *by the miniſtry of Moſes.* The three laſt of theſe, which I have quoted, deſerve your particular notice. In the firſt of them we have תורה אשר צוה יהוה ביד משה *the law, which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moſes.* In the ſecond we have התורת אשר נתן יהוה ביד משה *the laws, which the Lord made by the hand of Moſes.* And if you do not underſtand the elliptical expreſſion התורה ביד משה *the law by the hand of Moſes*, in the laſt of them; the full expreſſions in the two former will ſerve to explane it to you. But ſince, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 8, התורה ביד משה *the law by the hand of Moſes* means the law by the miniſtry of Moſes, you will not eaſily perſuade your readers to think with you, that it is *ſcarce poſſible for any words more naturally to deſcribe a book written by Moſes himſelf; or to vouch more fully, that the MS of the law found in the time of Joſiah was in the hand writing of Moſes*, than theſe, ספר תורת יהוה ביד משה — *the book of the law by the hand of Moſes.* 2 Chron. xxiv 14. Du Pin, to whom, though you have not acknowledged it, you are indebted for this interpretation of the ſacred hiſtorians words, whilſt he is proving, that Moſes was the writer of the pentateuch, ſays, [b] " that in the time " of king Joſiah, Hilkiah the high prieſt found in " the temple the book of the law of the Lord, writ- " ten by the hand of Moſes, as is intimated in the " Chronicles; which expreſſion *might incline one to* " *believe*, that it was the very copy itſelf, which Mo- " ſes wrote with his own hand. But though this " were not ſo, yet it cannot be queſtioned, but that " this book of the law, found in the houſe of the " Lord, was one of thoſe, which was preſerved in " the temple by the prieſts; and that if theſe words " —— *per manum Moiſi* —— do not denote, that this " was the copy written by Moſes's own hand, yet " they

[b] Hiſtory of Canon. &c. B. i. C. iii. S. 1. pag. 63.

" they do intimate at leaſt, that this book had been " compoſed by Moſes." The ſame expreſſion, which in his opinion *might incline one to believe*, that this was the very copy itſelf, which Moſes wrote with his own hand, ſeems to you to point this out ſo clearly, that *it is ſcarce poſſible for any words more naturally to deſcribe a book written by Moſes himſelf.* But though you would not have been accountable for the inaccuracy of this interpretation, if you had not made yourſelf ſo by not mentioning the name of the author, from whom you borrowed it; yet the confidence, with which you propoſe it, and the inaccuracy of the argument, by which you endeavour to remove all doubt about the truth of it, are entirely your own.—

To give the reader a full view of the inaccuracy, which I ſhall next point out to him; it will be neceſſary to carry him back to pages 497. 498. 499, of your firſt diſſertation, which was publiſhed in the year 1753; where you tell us, that the word חסידיך [*Sanctos tuos, thine holy ones*] Pſal. xvi. 10, which you ſay " *is almoſt univerſally* the leading word in the " printed Hebrew bibles," has been corrupted from חסידך [*Sanctum tuum, thine holy one.*] To the other authorities, which you had urged in proof of this, you add what you call " the concluſive authority of " Hebrew MSS. Of theſe you have examined 24, " which contain this pſalm: and of theſe 24, SIX-" TEEN *have now the true reading* חסידך *Sanctum* " *tuum*, writ regularly in the text; and *one more* had " this word חסידך" [*Sanctum tuum*] " at firſt; but " part of the horizontal ſtroke of the ך has been e-" raſed, and a ' inſerted by ſome late corrector. The " MSS, which happily diſcover this important read-" ing, are N°. 2. 3. 4. 5. 13. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. " 37. 60. and Cambridge MSS, 1. 2. 3. 4."—Theſe numbers refer to a catalogue of MSS in your firſt diſſertation, pag. 315——336. 341. 342.——You then conclude this article with obſerving, that " in " R. Stephen's bible it is properly חסידך."

We

We may be ſure, that there is no error of the preſs here; becauſe the number of MSS containing Pſal. xvi. which you had examined, when you wrote this, is twice ſaid to be 24. And the groſs number, *ſixteen*, which have the *ſingular* reading חסידך *Sanctum tuum*, with one more, which had the ſame reading, till it was altered, making in all ſeventeen, exactly agrees with the number of particular MSS here reckoned up.

If you had examined 24 MSS, and only 17 of them had the *ſingular* reading חסידך *Sanctum tuum*; then 7 muſt have had the *plural* reading חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*. You have not enumerated theſe: but as we are ſure, that we are right in the other two numbers, it is impoſſible, that we ſhould be wrong in this; for when 17 are deducted from 24, the remainder muſt be 7. Accordingly we find in your catalogue in this firſt diſſertation 7 MSS, which have the xvith pſalm in them; beſides the 17 juſt now enumerated; or however 7, which do not from your account appear to want it. They are N°. 6. 7. 27. 38. 59. 64. 65.

Let us now go on to your ſecond diſſertation, pag. 108; where you ſay—"I have now examined *thirty-* "*one* Heb. MSS, which contain this Pſalm; and "in TWENTY-SEVEN (*fifteen* of which are at Ox- "ford, *five* at Cambridge, *ſix* in the Britiſh Mu- "ſeum, and *one* in the poſſeſſion of Solomon DaCoſta, "Eſq;) there is very happily preſerved the true read- "ing חסידך [*ſanctum tuum*] in the *ſingular* number." —But if from 31 the whole number of MSS containing this pſalm, which you ſay you had examined, when you wrote this, we take 27 the number of MSS, in which you found the *ſingular* reading חסידך *ſanctum tuum*; the remainder having the *plural* reading חסידיך *ſanctos tuos* will be only 4.

Here again we may be ſure, that there is no error of the preſs. For in pages 346, and 563, you give us the ſame numbers: in the former you ſay—— "amongſt 31 Heb. MSS, in which I have found "this word; the *oldeſt* and beſt MSS, and the far "greater

" greater number, namely, *twenty-ſeven*, read it ex-
" preſsly as the apoſtles have quoted it," that is, *ſingular*——and in the latter——" it has been repeated-
" ly obſerved; that out of 31 Heb. MSS, which I
" have found to contain this pſalm, 27 authorize the
" *ſingular* word חסידך" *ſanctum tuum.*——" To
" theſe 27 you can now add another, preſerved in
" the archi-epiſcopal library at Lambeth, 8vo, N°
" 435: which reads alſo חסידך *thy holy one.*" Thus you have examined in all 32 MSS containing this pſalm; and in 28 you find the *ſingular* reading חסידך *ſanctum tuum.* Therefore according to this account you can have examined no more than 4, which have the *plural* reading חסידיך.

This is very ſtrange! when you wrote your firſt diſſertation and had examined 24 MSS, containing the xvith pſalm, you found at verſe 10th the *plural* reading in 7 of them. But when you wrote your ſecond diſſertation, and had examined 32 MSS, in which there is this pſalm, you found the plural reading only in 4. What therefore is become of the other three? If this is not inaccuracy; I know not what is.

By obſerving another inſtance of your inaccuracy, we ſhall find, where one of theſe three MSS is to be met with.—At the end of your ſecond diſſertation there is, what you call a concluding catalogue of MSS. I will tranſcribe as much of it as relates to the Pſalms; not that any one, into whoſe hands this letter may fall, need give himſelf the trouble of reading it over; but that he may by referring to it underſtand the more readily what follows.

" PSALMS MSS XXXV.

" 1 Bodleian Library N°. 461 ——— *
" 2 Bodleian Library N°. 3198 ——— *
" 3 Bodleian Library N°. 5351 ———
" 4 Bodleian Library N°. 5946 ——— *
" 16 Bodleian Library N°. 2880 ——— *

" 18 Bod-

" 18 Bodleian Library N°. 5356 ——— *
" 28 Bodleian Library Tanner 173 ——— *
" 29 Bodleian Library N°. 5934 begins at iii. 1.
" 32 Bodleian Library N°. 432 ——— *
" 33 Bodleian Library N°. 945 ——— *
" 34 Bodleian Library N°. 1542 ——— *
" 35 Bodleian Library N°. 1878 ——— *
" 36 Bodleian Library N°. 2271 ——— *
" 37 Bodleian Library N°. 3009 ——— *
" 38 Bodleian Library N°. 3317 ——— *
" 39 Bodleian Library N°. 5352 ——— *
" 40 Bodl. Library 7347. tom. 2. begins at iii. 1.
" 58 Corpus College W B 4, 6 ———
" 59 Corpus College W D 2, 1 ——— *
" 61 Jeſus College N°. 13 ———
" 65 Oriel College N°. 72. begins at xxxii. 8.
" 68 Cambridge Library, M m 5, 27 ——— *
" 71 Cambridge Library, E e 5, 9 ——— *
" 72 Caius College N°. 404 ——— *
" 73 Emanuel College N°. 1, 27 ——— *
" 74 Trinity College R. 8, 6 ——— *
" 75 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 1528 ——— *
" 76 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5498 ——— *
" 77 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5711 ——— *
" 92 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5506 ——— *
" 93 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5715 begins at xxviii. 8.
" 94 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5775 ——— *
" 96 Britiſh Muſeum Har. 5686 ——— *
" 100 Britiſh Muſeum Da Coſta, 2 ——— *
" 102 Lambeth Library N°. 435 begins at ii. 2. *

To this catalogue of MSS you add—" Eton copy printed A a 5. 1.—*" I have tranſcribed the catalogue as it ſtands in your book; except that I have left out your account of the ſize of each MS and of the leaf where the book of Pſalms begins in each. But I have taken care to copy the aſteriſcs, by which you " diſtinguiſh thoſe xxviii. MSS, which confirm the

" ſingular

" ſingular word חסידך in Pſalm xvi. 10." If the reader has not both your books at hand; it may be neceſſary here to inform him that the firſt numbers in this concluding catalogue do not refer to the catalogue in your *firſt* diſſertation; but to another, which you have given us in your *ſecond*.

The whole number of MSS of the Pſalms in this concluding catalogue is 35, as you ſay in the title of it. From hence, N°. 65, which begins at Pſalm xxxii. 8, and N°. 93, which begins at Pſalm xxviii. 8, being deducted; becauſe theſe two do not contain Pſalm xvi. 10; there will be 33 remaining.——— Thus it appears at laſt, that inſtead of examining only 32 MSS, containing Pſalm xvi, as you told us at page 563, you have examined 33. Of theſe 33 there are only 28 marked with aſteriſcs, to ſhew, that they have the *ſingular* reading חסידך *ſanctum tuum*: therefore inſtead of 4, which are all that you allow, at page 563, to have the *plural* reading, we find from your own catalogue, that there are 5.

And yet after this ſecond diſſertation and its concluding catalogue were publiſhed; you return in your propoſals *for collating the Hebrew MSS*, to your old numbers; and tell the public, that 28 out of 32 MSS confirm the *ſingular* reading.

You will ſcarce deny, that you have examined all theſe 5, which have no aſteriſcs to them: for they are all at Oxford, 3 in the *Bodleian*, 1 in *Corpus* college, and 1 in *Jeſus* college. I preſume, you would not have it thought, that you were ſo negligent, as to let any MS in your Univerſity, which has the xvith Pſalm in it, paſs without examining, whether it *happily diſcovers* the *famous* various reading at the 10th verſe, or not. I have indeed no doubt, that theſe 5 MSS, which are marked in your concluding catalogue, 3. 29. 40. 58. 61. are the ſame with thoſe, which in your firſt diſſertation are marked 6. 27. 38. 59. 64. and theſe are 5 of the 7, which, as we may collect from that diſſertation, you had examined.

We

We have thus at the expence of your accuracy found out *one* of the 3 MSS, which we had loſt. According to your repeated account of the whole number of MSS containing this Pſalm, which you had examined, and of the number, which have the *ſingular* reading; there could be only 4, which have the *plural* reading: but your concluding catalogue has ſhewn us, that this repeated account is only a repeated miſtake, and that in fact you have ſeen 5, which have this reading.

As we have ſucceeded ſo well in this inſtance; let us try, how well we ſhall ſucceed in looking for the other two MSS, which are ſtill wanting to make up the 7, which according to your account in your *firſt* diſſertation have the *plural* reading.

In that diſſertation you had mentioned two MSS containing the Pſalms in Jeſus College library: their numbers there are 64 and 65; and neither of them according to your account, which I have tranſcribed above, at page 157, has the *ſingular* reading. Of theſe two MSS only N° 64 has a place in either catalogue of your *ſecond* diſſertation. I ſuppoſe this to be the MS, which in both theſe catalogues is marked 61; though this MS 61 is ſaid to be catalogued N°. 13 in the library of Jeſus college, and MS 64 in your *firſt* diſſertation was ſaid to be catalogued 48 in that library: for the numbers in that library may have been altered; and unleſs they have; you have not either of thoſe two MSS belonging to Jeſus college in the catalogues of your *ſecond* diſſertation, which appear in the catalogue of your *firſt*. However, N° 65, which according to your *firſt* diſſertation was one of thoſe, which have the *plural* reading, is certainly dropped in both catalogues of your *ſecond*. And thus the number of MSS having this reading is reduced to 6.— This MS you had thus deſcribed—[c] *Pſalms*—dated 1602. The lateneſs of its date might be a reaſon for paſſing it over: but this reaſon would have held as ſtrongly againſt your taking notice of it in your *firſt*

[c] Diſſ. 1. pag. 336.

diſ-

diſſertation, as in your *ſecond*; and will not excuſe your dropping it now, without telling your readers, that you have done ſo; as you had taken notice of it before.

We have ſtill one more MS to look for, which has the *plural* reading, according to your account in your *firſt* diſſertation. The MS, which I ſhould fix upon for that, which we want, is marked there N°. 7. —The deſcription of it is—"[d] *Bodley*.—compleat bi-" ble; except Joſh. Jud. Sam. Kin. Jer. and Ezek. " —3 large vol. fol.—Archiv. A. 95. 96. 97."—In your *ſecond* diſſertation, pag. 519, MS N°. 16 is thus deſcribed —— " Pent. Prophets poſter. (except " Jerem. and Ezek.) and Hagiographa, 3 vol. fol. " 2878. 2879. 2880:" and it is in the Bodleian library. This MS therefore like N°. 7 in your *firſt* diſſertation, is a compleat bible, except the prior prophets, that is, Joſhua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, and two of the poſterior prophets, Jerem. and Ezekiel; and this likewiſe conſiſts, as that does, of 3 vol. fol. and is in the ſame library. —As there is not any MS in the catalogue of your *ſecond* diſſertation beſides this N°. 16, which agrees in all theſe reſpects with N°. 7 in your *firſt* diſſertation, I may venture to ſay, that they are one and the ſame. But it happens, that though N°. 7 in your *firſt* diſſertation is one of thoſe MSS, in which Pſalm xvi. 10 has the plural reading חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*; yet in the concluding catalogue of your *ſecond* diſſertation you have put an aſteriſc to N°. 16, which is the ſame book, and ſo rank it amongſt thoſe, which have the *ſingular* reading חסידך *ſanctum tuum*.

Let us ſtop here a little and review this train of inaccuracies——According to your account in your *firſt* diſſertation, you had examined 24 MSS, which contain the xvith Pſalm; and in 17 of theſe the reading at verſe 10th is *ſingular*: the conſequence of which is, that in 7 the reading muſt be *plural*. But in your *ſecond* diſſertation, when you tell us, that you

[d] Diſſ. 1. pag. 326.

you had ſeen 32 MSS containing this Pſalm, you add, that 28 of theſe have the *ſingular* reading: conſequently there can be only 4, which have the *plural* reading; ſo that 3 of thoſe, which had the *plural* reading before, are miſſing. From comparing your concluding catalogue with this account we find, that you have here given us the wrong numbers: for, inſtead of 32, you have examined 33 MSS, which have Pſalm xvi. 10, in them; and inſtead of 4, there are 5, which have the *plural* reading. And yet in your propoſals you return to the old numbers, 32 MSS in all, of which 28 have the *ſingular* reading, and conſequently no more than 4 have the *plural*. In your *ſecond* diſſertation, without giving your readers notice, you have dropped one MS, which is in Jeſus college library in Oxford, and has the *plural* reading; though you had mentioned it in your *firſt* diſſertation. And to cloſe the train, you have in your *ſecond* diſſertation ranked one MS amongſt thoſe, which have the *ſingular* reading; though according to your *firſt* it was amongſt thoſe, in which the reading is *plural*.——

There is no one inſtance, in which you have made ſo many miſtakes, as in what you have written about this various reading, which you boaſt to be [c] "*ſuch* an "one as has been judged by the learned, in England, "a powerful recommendation of our Heb. MSS, "and has been applauded by the learned, in other "countries, as of very ſingular importance." Somebody had objected, that the word חסידיך may be ſingular; and [d] had produced מברכיך ברוך (*Gen.* xxvii. 29. and *Num.* xxiv. 9.) as an inſtance to prove, that a word may be ſingular, though it is in this form. "You reply, that this phraſe may be taken diſtribu-"tively, *bleſſed be every one of thoſe, who bleſs thee.*" But you were not contented with giving ſuch an obvious anſwer, as any one elſe might have given; you therefore add — "as to ſingular participles in poe-"tical places, *ſæpiuſcule adeſt* ' *paragogicum.* Buxtorf. "Theſaur.

[c] Diſſ. 2. pag. 108. [d] Diſſ. 2. pag. 563.

" Theſaur. pag. 103." — Did you think, that the ' in מברכיך can poſſibly be a parogogic ' and come under Buxtorfs rule? The common Latin and Greek grammars ſay — *Paragoge eſt appoſitio literæ vel ſyllabæ ad finem dictionis*; — *Paragoge eſt cum extremæ ſyllabæ aliquid adjungitur.* And I cannot find any Hebrew grammar, which gives us any other notion of a paragogic letter. But a ' inſerted before a ſuffix is not at the end of the word, and therefore is not a paragogic '. However, I will not diſpute with you about a name: but as Breitinger in a paſſage referred to above [e] calls the Greek letter ν, when added to the end of a word, an epenthetic ν, ſo you may call a ', which is inſerted before the laſt ſyllable, a paragogic '; if you pleaſe. But then you muſt obſerve, that this is not a paragogic ' within Buxtorfs meaning: becauſe in all the examples, which he produces to illuſtrate and confirm his rule, the ' is at the end of the word, as a paragogic ' ought to be. The examples are אסרי ligans Gen. xlix. 11. חקקי exſcindens, חצבי cædens, Iſ. xxii. 16. ישבי reſidens Pſal. cxxiii. 1. שכני inhabitans Deut. xxxiii. 16. vid. etiam Zach. xi. 17. Pſal. cxiv. 8.

Your account of the ſtate of the printed Hebrew text, Pſalm xvi. 10, is likewiſe very inaccurate. In your firſt diſſertation, after you had let us know, at page 497, that the leading word is *almoſt univerſally* חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*; you add, at page 499 — that " in " R. Stephens bible it is properly חסידך;" and at page 522 — that it "is חסידך *thy holy one* in the " Eton edition." When you wrote your ſecond diſſertation, as you had examined more MSS, ſo one would have expected, that you would have examined more printed books: but here without adding any to thoſe, which you had mentioned before, you ſay, that " *one word*," meaning the word, which we have been conſidering " is printed in the Hebrew, not only " in a ſenſe different from that given of it by two " apoſtles,

[e] See pag. 144.

" apoſtles, but alſo in a ſenſe ſubverſive of the ar-
" gument, which they build upon it." And in the firſt edition of your propoſals for collating the Hebrew MSS you tell us, that "in one important pro-
" phecy no leſs than 28 out of 32 MSS confirm a
" quotation made by St. Peter and St. Paul; and
" this in a caſe, where the *printed* Hebrew text in-
" validates the reaſoning of both theſe apoſtles." If the reader wants a comment to explain what prophecy you mean, he may find it in your ſecond diſſertation, at page 107; where you inform us, that "when
" St. Peter and St. Paul appeal to the Jews, concern-
" ing the reſurrection of Chriſt — that David pro-
" pheſied of *the reſurrection of ſome one holy perſon,*
" *who was to die, yet not to ſee corruption. This*, ſay
" they, *we declare to be fulfilled in Jeſus Chriſt* — if
" the word in Pſalm xvi. 10, in which this prophecy
" is contained, was חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*, the prophe-
" cy of a particular reſurrection would then vaniſh —
" and both *Peter* and *Paul* would *be found falſe wit-*
" *neſſes in the cauſe of God.*" — When your propoſals firſt came out, an objection was made to this part of them, which put me upon looking into ſeveral printed Hebrew bibles: and the event has been, that beſides one by R. Stephen, which you take notice of, not in theſe propoſals, but in your *firſt* diſſertation, I have found eight well-known editions, in which the reading is חסידך *thy holy one*. I have ſeen two bibles by R. Stephen, one in 4to, and the other in 12mo. As I cannot tell which you mean, I will put both of them into the following liſt, which will make the number 9. Theſe printed bibles are

1 Biblia Complutenſia. ——— 1517.
2 Bibl. Heb. cura Felicis Pratenſis. ——Venet. 1518.
3 ——— cum. verſ. et not. Munſteri Baſil. 1534.
4 ——— per Froben, Baſ. 1536.
5 ——— per Stephan. 4to. Paris. 1540.
6 ——— per Stephan. 12mo. Paris. 1565.
7 ——cum annot. Vatabli ex offic. Commelin. 1599.

8 Bibl. Heb. cura et ſtudio Hutteri. Hamb. 1587.
9 ——————————————— iterum. Colon. 1603.

Beſides theſe bibles I have looked into ſome editions of the pſalter, and find that in the *printed* Hebrew text the word is חסידך *ſanctum tuum* in the 11, which follow;

1 Pſalt. polygl. impreſs. P. P. Porrus Genuæ. 1516.
2 ——————— ſtudio Jo. Potken. —— Colon. 1518.
3 ——————— ſtudio Eliæ Hutteri. —— Amſt. 1615.
4 ——————————— per W. S. —— Lond. 1643.
5 Pſalt. Heb. — cum comment. R. D. Kimchi. 1542.
6 ——————————————— Lugd. Batav. 1592.
7 —cum lib. Thren. p. Gul. Robertſon. Lond. 1656.
8 ——————— inter opera Hieron. — Baſil. 1516.
9 ——————————————— Paris. 1533.
10 ——————————————— Baſil. 1537.
11 ——————————————— Baſil. 1565.

There may be, and probably are, more bibles and pſalters, which have the *ſingular* reading: but theſe, which are here enumerated, I have ſeen. And thus, though you ſay in your propoſals, "that the *printed* "Hebrew text invalidates the argument of St. Peter and "St. Paul," yet at leaſt 20 *printed* copies of the Pſalms have the ſame reading חסידך *ſanctum tuum*, which you find in 28 MSS, according to your preſent reckoning. And I am at a loſs to know, why theſe 20 books are not as much a *printed* Hebrew text, as the others, which have חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*.

I hardly know in what light you would have us ſee the Eton copy: becauſe by calling it, as it is, a *printed copy*, and yet at the ſame time [m] ranking it amongſt the MSS, you ſeem to have contrived to give yourſelf an opportunity of conſidering it as an exception to what you have ſaid in your propoſals about the

[m] Diſſ. 2. pag. 578. Concluding catalogue at the bottom of Ruth, and the other parts of the Hagiographa.

the *printed* Hebrew text, or as no exception to it, juſt as your occaſions may happen to require. If we reckon this amongſt the printed books; you have mentioned two inſtances of printed books, out of at leaſt 21, which have the *ſingular* reading. But then you mentioned them only in your *firſt* diſſertation, which was publiſhed 7 years before your propoſals: and when theſe propoſals came out, they were circulated in the news papers, and were otherwiſe put into the hands of many, who had not read, and of many, who could not read, that diſſertation. By telling ſuch perſons, as theſe, that "28 MSS out of 32 in one important "prophecy confirm a quotation made by S. Peter "and Saint Paul, in a caſe, where the *printed* He-"brew text invalidates the reaſoning of both theſe "apoſtles;" not only without letting them know, that by *printed* Hebrew text you mean no more, than the printed text in ſome editions, for that the printed text in ſeveral other editions, ſome of which are capital ones, is the ſame as in theſe 28 MSS, but even without giving them the leaſt intimation of one or two exceptions, which you had before mentioned in your book, you could ſcarce fail of leading them to think, that the collation of Hebrew MSS is of more importance, than this inſtance would have ſhewn it to be, if they had been acquainted with the whole truth.

In your *firſt* diſſertation you had ſaid, that the "lead-"ing word in the printed Hebrew bibles is *almoſt uni-"verſally* חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*." This expreſſion will ſcarcely be thought juſtifiable, when there are at leaſt 21 editions, in which it is חסידך *ſanctum tuum:* for though you ſay *bibles* you ought to include *pſalters*, when you are ſpeaking of printed books, becauſe in order to make up 28 MSS, which have the *ſingular* reading, you take in ſeveral, which contain only the Pſalms. But if this expreſſion—*almoſt univerſally*—may be reaſonably objected to, how will you juſtify your uſing in your propoſals ſuch a general one, as that other of

—*printed* Hebrew text,—without having firſt ſearched all the capital editions of the bible, and as many more as you conveniently could, to find what exceptions there are to it, and then mentioning all, which you had found? If you had mentioned all, which you might have found, your general poſition, that "the *printed* "Hebrew text invalidates the reaſoning of St. Peter "and St. Paul," would have been ſo far exhauſted by them, that no one would have thought it worth notice.

This conduct was neceſſary not only on account of ſuch readers of your propoſals, as I have hitherto been ſpeaking of, but likewiſe of ſeveral, who had read your *firſt* diſſertation, and remembered the exceptions, which you had mentioned in it; though it was publiſhed ſeven years before your propoſals: becauſe ſuch of theſe, as have no opportunity of conſulting any great number of printed Hebrew bibles, would from your propoſals and your book together have too partial a repreſentation *of the ſtate of the printed Hebrew text* in this inſtance to be able to judge rightly from it about the importance of the work, in which you wanted to be employed. When they come to know the true ſtate of it, they will be apt to think with me, that if you knew of no more exceptions, you were inaccurate in a matter, in which you are for ever inculcating the vaſt conſequence of your having conſulted the Hebrew MSS. What they will think, if you did know of more, and deſignedly ſaid nothing of them, I leave you to judge.

You have changed your expreſſion in the ſecond edition of you propoſals; and now inſtead of —"*print*-"*ed* Hebrew text"—you ſay —"reading as *printed* "in the Hebrew text by Maſoretic authority;" agreeably to what you had before ſaid in your ſecond diſſertation, page 107, that "in the text of the xvith "Pſalm, we find the word" in queſtion "to be there, "(and authorized in the text by the Maſora)" — חסידיך *thy ſaints*. But before you are ſure, that you have changed it for the better; it may be worth the while

while to conſider, whether חסידיך *ſanctos tuos*, can be ſaid to be *printed* in the Hebrew text by Maſoretic authority, or to be authorized in the text by the Maſora; when the Maſoretic note in the margin ſays, that the ' is redundant.

You elſewhere tell us, that [f] "that the Maſora—— "*commands* חסידך *thy holy one* to be written חסידיך "*thy ſaints.*" How ſo? What; becauſe the former is called the קרי Keri and the latter the כתיב Cetib? Keri does indeed denote a command to read. But can you ſhew, that Cetib denotes a command to write? I have the beſt authority, that I could have in a diſpute with you, I mean your own, to prove, that Cetib does not denote ſuch a command, and that where there is a marginal reading, or Keri, the Maſorites are ſo far from authorizing the word in the text, that they conſider it as an error. For upon another occaſion after obſerving, that [g] as "the Mohammedan "Maſora has proved ineffectual" for preſerving the Koran from corruption, ſo "the ſame may have been "the caſe with the Maſora of the Rabbins; you "aſk — *May have been?* — does not this Maſora it-"ſelf declare it to *have been?* Is its own language in-"telligible upon any other ſuppoſition? Does it not "ſay — *ſuch a word is* (כתיב) WRITTEN *in the* "*text*; but (קרי) READ *ſuch a word*, READ *the* "*word given in the margin?* And what can be, if "this be not, a confeſſion of error in the text?" Thus we find, that כתיב [Cetib] is a word, which you have at your devotion. When you want, at page 469, to prove, that the Maſora is ſuch a rule, as eſtabliſhes errors in the text; then כתיב [Cetib] has an active and imperative ſignification, and denotes *a command to write* חסידיך *thy ſaints.* But, at page 272, when you want to prove, that the Maſora declares itſelf to have been inſufficient to preſerve the text from corruption, then כתיב [Cetib] has a paſſive and indicative ſignification, and only means, that ſuch a word *is written* in the text, whilſt

[f] Diſſ. 2. pag. 469. [g] Diſſ. 2. pag. 272. &c.

whilſt the קרי [Keri] informs us, that this word is an error, by commanding us to read the word, which is in the margin. ——

I perſuade myſelf, that notwithſtanding the remarks, which I have been making on your *ſecond* diſſertation, I have no occaſion to make any apology to you, and I hope, that I have no occaſion to make any to the Univerſity of Cambridge, for any ſhare, which I may have had in recommending your propoſals for collating the Hebrew MSS to the notice of this learned body. Many of the members of our ſenate knew, before theſe propoſals came to my hands, what opinion I had of your book: for I never from my firſt reading of it made any ſecret of my opinion about it; though perhaps what I thought of that part of it, which relates to the Samaritan pentateuch, might be known here more publicly afterwards. But I found, that ſome of the gentlemen, to whom I mentioned your ſubſcription, agreed with me, that very different qualifications are required to make an accurate writer, and to make an accurate collator of MSS. To ſee clearly and diſtinctly every part and circumſtance of the ſubject, upon which one is writing; to attend to all of them, ſo as to make all ones reaſonings and concluſions about it conſiſtent with them; in reading what others have written on the ſame ſubject to take notice of every fact related by them, which has any connection with it, and of every obſervation, which they have made upon it; and then to remember all theſe minutely, when there is occaſion to apply them —— this is a very different thing from being able to read the characters of a MS, to attend to the words and the letters, which it contains, whilſt we are comparing them with the words and letters of ſome other copy of the ſame book, and to put down the difference without making any miſtake. The former is the accuracy of a ſcholar; the latter is the accuracy of a copyiſt. I have now laid before the reader ſeveral in-

inſtances taken from your *ſecond* diſſertation, in which there appears to me to be ſome want of the former. But notwithſtanding theſe inſtances I was willing at your requeſt to ſpeak favourably of your propoſals to ſuch members of our ſenate, as I have the honour to be acquainted with; becauſe I thought, that you had a good degree of the latter. Some of the inſtances, which I have produced, might indeed make one ſuſpect, that you have not even this kind of accuracy in the higheſt degree: but I truſted, and if my memory does not fail me, I told ſome of my friends, that whatever overſights you might have committed, whilſt you were warm in the defence of ſome favourite point; yet when you ſhould ſet coolly down to collate MSS, with no other purpoſe in view, beſides that of repreſenting their various readings, we might expect to find you more careful. I cannot help adding, that, when I applied to the Univerſity to contribute towards paying you for the trouble, which you would have, and towards bearing the expences, which you might make, in carrying on this work; I did not deſign to make myſelf anſwerable for the truth of what you ſay in your propoſals, that "*when* "*the various readings ſhall be publiſhed, they will form a* "*ſafe and authentic record; which (though the MSS* "*ſhould entirely periſh) will be always ready, either* "*to reform the Hebrew text, or correct our own ver-* "*ſion.*" Whatever great things you might preſage about that record of various readings, which you wanted to be employed in making, my expectations about it were rather more moderate. Though I ſhould have been ſorry to have had the *Hebrew text* entruſted with you to be new-modelled, as you might think proper, in a critical edition of it; yet as I was deſirous, that the *Hebrew* MSS might be collated, I was glad to find, that you would undertake to collate them; becauſe I knew of no one, ſo well qualified for this kind of work as yourſelf, who would be willing to ſet down to it. In

the

the mean time I did not expect, that your collection of various readings would be free from all miſtakes, nor did I pay ſuch an implicit deference to your authority, as to ſay or to think, that as ſoon as you ſhall have collated any MS, it may be immediately burnt; for that no body elſe can ever have any occaſion to look into it afterwards.

I am,

Reverend SIR,

Your obedient &c.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Have lately met with the following advertiſement in the public news papers.

In the Preſs,
and ſpeedily will be Publiſhed,
AN ANSWER
to *a Letter* lately advertiſed, as ſent to the Preſs,
by T. RUTHERFORTH, D.D. F.R.S.
The King's Profeſſor of Divinity in Cambridge, and
Chaplain to her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs Dowager of Wales,
BY
B. KENNICOTT, Fellow of *Exeter* College.
——*I ſee in your ingenious Diſſertation the ſtrongeſt marks of* very extraordinary Diligence, and ſingular Sagacity.
Extract of Dr. RUTHERFORTH's Letter to Mr. KENNICOTT; dated Feb. 18, 1753.

You have had your jeſt of advertiſing, before the foregoing letter was printed, that you had an anſwer to it in the preſs. Whether you intend to carry on this jeſt, and to publiſh your anſwer, before the letter is publiſhed, I know not. In one view this may ſeem to be a prudent meaſure: for it is eaſier to advertiſe an anſwer, than to write one; and perhaps it may be eaſier to write an anſwer to this letter, before it is publiſhed, than it will be afterwards. In every other view it might be as proper for you in a matter of this ſort to be a little more ſerious. "The ſubject" of your *ſecond* diſſertation, according to your own account of it, at page 579, "is "no leſs then an attempt to point out the genuine "words of that *Revelation*, which God made to the "Jews, which however was written, not for that na- "tion only, but alſo for the benefit of the whole "chriſtian world." And in the ſame page you thus deſcribe the qualifications, which are neceſſary for the right uſing of theſe or of any other means for attain-

ing this purpoſe — "Certainly the moſt ſolid judg-
" ment, the moſt maſterly ſkill, and the moſt ſacred
" regard to truth, ſhould conjointly be applied in
" freeing *holy ſcripture* from every miſtake of tran-
" ſcribers and printers." I preſume, that you deſigned here to enumerate all the neceſſary qualifications, and conſequently that in the notion of the moſt maſterly ſkill you include conſummate accuracy. In the concluſion of the foregoing letter I have endeavoured to ſhew you what ſort of accuracy is required in collating MSS. But the deſign of the letter itſelf is to enquire, whether we could find in your *ſecond* diſſertation that conſummate accuracy of quite a different ſort, and that moſt ſolid judgment, which muſt conjointly be applied in freeing the old teſtament from every miſtake of tranſcribers and printers in a critical edition of the Hebrew text.

The extract in your advertiſement from a private letter of mine, dated *Feb.* 18. 1753, relates only to your *firſt* diſſertation. When therefore the queſtion between us is;—How far the inſtances produced in the preſent letter will juſtify my ſaying, that your *ſecond* diſſertation publiſhed in *Dec.* 1759, almoſt ſeven years after the date of that letter, is injudicious and inaccurate? — this extract is nothing to the purpoſe: and I truſt, that our readers will not ſuffer you by throwing in ſuch incidental or rather ſuch foreign matter to draw off their attention from the point in debate.

But the leaſt fault of this extract is its being nothing to the purpoſe. In conſequence of your requeſt to me, very early in the year 1753, that I would give you my real ſentiments on your *firſt* diſſertation, which was then juſt publiſhed, I acquainted you in my letter, dated *Feb.* 18, in the ſame year, that though I agreed with you, that there are errors in the printed Hebrew copies, yet in one [a] point I could not help differing from you. As far as I was able

[a] See Diſſ. 1. pag. 565—569.

able to judge, no emendation could be ſo fully eſtabliſhed by any or by all the means of emending, which you had propoſed, as to warrant you in giving it a place in the *text*, if you ſhould ever publiſh an edition of the Hebrew bible. And I have the ſatisfaction to find my opinion confirmed by the example of the learned Houbigant, who has thought proper in a matter of this vaſt importance to pay a becoming deference to the judgment of his readers by placing his corrections in the margin of his valuable edition. Nay I have the ſatisfaction to find, that in the ſecond edition of your propoſals you tell the public, that your new edition of the Hebrew bible is to be "printed (*not with a new text*, but) from one of "the beſt editions already publiſhed, with the va-"rious readings ſubjoined at the botom of the page." After having ſet forth at large my reaſons, ſuch as they were, for differing from you in this point, which, as I afterwards found, was then a favourite one with you; I wrote to this effect, that as there was ſo little appearance of flattery in what I had been ſaying, you would be the more likely to think me ſincere, when I told you, that "I ſaw in your inge-"nious diſſertation the ſtrongeſt marks of very "extraordinary diligence and ſingular ſagacity." And to ſhew you farther, that I was not diſpoſed to flatter you, but to give you, what you had aſked for, my real ſentiments, I pointed out to you in the ſame letter ſeveral particular paſſages in your book, in which I diſagreed from you. I did not indeed call them in ſo many words inſtances of injudiciouſneſs and inaccuracy: but I ſpoke of them in ſuch a manner, as to ſhew you plainly enough, that this letter, of *Feb.* 18. 1753, was not intended to be an encomium without any exceptions on that *firſt* diſſertation. A rough draught of this letter, which I happen to have by me, does, I believe, differ a little in expreſſion from the letter itſelf; and perhaps in tranſcribing I might make ſome ſmall alteration in the me-

thod;

thod; but I am ſure that they agree with one another as to the general ſubſtance. And in whatever light you may now be willing to have others ſee this letter concerning your *firſt* diſſertation, ſince I have charged your *ſecond* with being injudicious and inaccurate; I know, that when you received it, you thought, that it was not a letter *full in the complimental ſtile*, but that I had ventured to tell you freely of what then appeared to me to be *errors* in that book.

I have all along been willing to take the favourable ſide, and to ſuppoſe, that there is in your *ſecond* diſſertation rather a want of accuracy than of what you reckon the third neceſſary qualification in any one, who ſhall undertake to aſcertain the genuine words of holy ſcripture and to free it from every miſtake of tranſcribers and printers; I mean a moſt ſacred regard to truth. But I do not know what our readers may be led to think by your extract from my letter. For though I make no queſtion, but that the very words of this extract were in it; yet plain and unprejudiced people may be apt to ſuſpect, that by ſetting theſe words out to view ſtripped of the circumſtances, with which they were attended, that is, by telling what is true, without telling the whole truth, you deſigned to deceive them. And when you have once raiſed in their minds a ſuſpicion of this ſort; it is impoſſible to ſay, how far they may extend it.

Cambridge
Nov. 3. 1761.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

THE END.

Books printed for and ſold by W. THURLBOURN *and* J. WOODYER, *in* Cambridge.

1. A Syſtem of Natural Philoſophy, being a Courſe of Lectures in *Mechanics*, *Optics*, *Hydroſtatics*, and *Aſtronomy*. in 2 Vol. 4to.

2. An Eſſay on Virtue, 4to.

3. Two Sermons preached before the Univerſity, on *May* 29, and *June* 11, 1747, 4to.

4. A Sermon on Miracles, at the Primary Viſitation of the Right Rev. the Lord Biſhop of *Ely*, 4to.

5. A Defence of the Lord Biſhop of *London*'s Diſcourſes on Prophecy, in a Letter to Dr. *Middleton*, 8vo. 2d Edition.

6. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of *Eſſex*, at a Viſitation *July* 10, 11, 12, 1753.

7. Diſſertatio de Immolatione Iſaaci.

8. Inſtitutes of Natural and Political Law, being the ſubſtance of a Courſe of Lectures on *Grotius* read in St. *John*'s College in *Cambridge*, in 2 Vol. 8vo. 1756.

All theſe by the Rev. Dr. RUTHERFORTH, *Regius Profeſſor of Divinity.*

1. CONſiderations on the Theory of Religion, in 3 Parts. 4th Edition, corrected. To which are added, two Diſcourſes; and an Appendix on the Uſe of the Word SOUL, and the State of Death deſcribed in Holy Scriptures.

2. Enquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time, Immenſity and Eternity. As alſo the ſelf Exiſtence, neceſſary Exiſtence and Unity of the Divine Nature.

3. The Nature and Neceſſity of Catechiſing.

4. A Diſcourſe on the Life and Character of Chriſt.

5. Litigiouſneſs repugnant to the Laws of Chriſtianity; a Sermon preach'd at the Cathedral Church of Carliſle, at the Aſſizes held there.

The above five by EDMUND LAW, *D. D. Maſter of St.* Peter's *College*, Cambridge.

6. An Eſſay on the Origin of Evil: By Dr. *William King*, late Lord Archbiſhop of Dublin. Tranſlated from the Latin with Notes; and a Diſſertation concerning the Principle and Criterion of Virtue, and the Origin of the Paſſions. the 2d Edition corrected and en-

enlarged from the Author's MSS. To which are added, two Sermons by the ſame Author; the former concerning Divine Preſcience; the latter on the Fall of Man. [never before publiſhed.] By *Edm. Law*, D.D. 2 Vol. 8vo.

7. S. Puffendorfii de Officio Hominis & Civis juxta Legem Naturalem, Libri duo, ſelectis Variorum Notis, maximeque propriis illuſtravit, celeberrimi Buddei, Hiſtoriam Juris Naturalis Notis adauctam præmiſit Indicemque Rerum ſubjunxit Tho. Johnſon, A. M. Coll. Magd. Cant. Soc. Editio 4ta.

8. Fabii Quintiliani Inſtitutionum Oratoriarum Libri 12. ad Uſum Scholarum accommodati, reciſis quæ minus neceſſaria viſa ſunt, & brevibus notis illuſtrati, à Carolo Rollin, Antiquo Rectore Univerſitatis Paris, Regio Eloquentiæ Profeſſore: necnon regiæ Inſcriptionum & Numiſmatum Acad. Socio, Edit. Nova 1758.

9. The Elements of Algebra, in ten Books: By *Nicholas Saunderſon*, LL.D. late Lucaſian Profeſſor of the Mathematicks in the Univ. of Cambridge, 2 Vols. 4to.

10. Select Parts of *Saunderſon*'s Algebra for the Uſe of Students, 8vo. 2d Edit.

11. Remarks upon a late Diſcourſe of Free-thinking: In a Letter to *T. H.* D.D. By *Bentley*. 8vo.

12. Euripidis Hecuba, Oreſtes, & Phœniſſæ cum Scholiis antiquis; ac Verſione, Notiſque *Johannes King*, ferè integris; curante *Thoma Morell*: Qui Alceſtin adjecit, cum Scholiis quæ extant, nova Verſione, & Notis perpetuis, 2 Vol. 8vo.

13. Pub. Terentii Afri Comœdiæ, Phædri Fabulæ Æſopiæ, Publii Syri & aliorum veterum Sententiæ, ex Recenſione & cum notis *Richardi Bentleii*, 4to.

14. Q. Horatii Flacci Epiſtolæ ad Piſones & Auguſtum: with an Engliſh Commentary and Notes. To which are added, two Diſſertations: The one on the Provinces of the ſeveral Species of Dramatic Poetry; the other, on Poetical Imitation. 2 vols. 8vo. 3d Edit.

15. Moral and Political Dialogues between divers eminent Perſons in the paſt and preſent Age: with Notes critical and explanatory, by the Editor. 2d Edit. 8vo.